Columbia University
in the City of New York
THE LIBRARIES

Bequest of
Frederic Bancroft
1860-1945

21A
E

WORKS OF

THE RIGHT REVEREND JOHN ENGLAND

THE WORKS OF THE RIGHT REVEREND

JOHN ENGLAND

FIRST BISHOP OF CHARLESTON

Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index
under the direction of

THE MOST REVEREND SEBASTIAN G. MESSMER
Archbishop of Milwaukee

With Portraits

VOLUME VI

Cleveland, Ohio
The Arthur H. Clark Company
1908

936
Em 34
v. 6

COPYRIGHT 1908, BY

THE ARTHUR H. CLARK COMPANY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

39626 C

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI

PART V. OCCASIONAL LETTERS

Letter on the Definition of Faith 9

Letters on Political Measures about Ireland 13

Letter on the Relations of the Catholic Church and Feudalism 94

Letter Concerning the Mattingly Miracle 102

Letters from Rome 157

Letters on N. P. Willis's "First Impressions of Europe" 207

Letter to Chancellor Desaussure 227

Pastoral Letters 233

Letter on Civic and Political Duties to the Roman Catholic Citizens of Charleston 352

Letter for the Cathedral Church of Baltimore 373

Catholic Emancipation in Ireland 376

Letter in Behalf of the Catholic Congregations which Suffered by the Great Fire at Charleston 384

Letters in the Hogan Case 389

Harold Correspondence 487

PART V

OCCASIONAL LETTERS

LETTER ON THE DEFINITION OF FAITH

CHARLESTON, S. C., Mar. 31, 1825.

To the Right Reverend Dr. David, Bishop of Mauricastro, Coadjutor to the Bishop of Bardstown, and so forth.

Right Reverend and Dear Sir:—The letter written by you to the editors of the *Miscellany,* dated 11th of February, 1825, Bardstown, has been given to me by the publishers of that work, after they had taken from it those directions which regarded themselves. The following passage arrested my attention:—"I shall, however, take the liberty to remark, that the definition of faith, in No. 6, page 90, Vol. iii. [*Sup.* 355.] 'Faith is the sincere disposition to believe all that God has taught,' does not appear to me theologically accurate. For it seems to me that this disposition can be in one who as yet knows nothing of the revealed truths, and who consequently has no faith. The definition of St. Paul, *Heb.* xi., implies the knowledge of the things we hope for, and the conviction of the things that are not seen."

This passage, sir, was written by me, and I find, upon reading your letter, that it is at least liable to misconception.[1] Perhaps, strictly speaking, it is theologically inaccurate. Nothing can be of greater importance; nothing more clearly your duty and mine, than in the language of doctrine to preserve the strictest accuracy. Allow me then to thank you for your remark, and to subscribe to the truth of your observation.

In the essay in which the passage is found, my object was to examine the moral criminality or innocence of a person, who was invincibly ignorant of the truth; and the inaccuracy of my expression arose from my not clearly expressing the distinction between the disposition to believe and the actual belief. Actual faith is posi-

[1] The word "Faith" is often used indiscriminately. In its use for religious discussion the necessity of distinguishing must be kept closely in view. The Vatican Council teaches that divine Faith "which is the beginning of man's salvation, is a supernatural virtue, whereby, inspired and assisted by the grace of God, we believe that the things which He has revealed are true; not because of the intrinsic truth of the things, viewed by the natural light of reason, but because of the authority of God himself who reveals them, and Who can neither be deceived, nor deceive." —ED.

tive belief upon the testimony of God. It is not by faith we believe what reason exhibits to us as true: if reason exhibits truth, any farther evidence would be superfluous. We pay no homage to God by assenting to what is manifest to ourselves. The homage of faith consists in the recognition of God's superior knowledge, and of our obligation to believe what he knows and teaches, but which surpasses our comprehension; and this belief is founded upon our certainty that God cannot deceive us, that he cannot say that which is not the fact. When, therefore, I know that God has revealed any doctrine, I never attempt to test its truth or its falsehood by the criterion of my reason, for this would be to examine whether what God has revealed is true: this would be making my reason, and not the divine word, the criterion of truth. He, therefore, who knows that the Lord has revealed a doctrine which is above man's comprehension, and believes it upon the authority of God, has faith, provided he is disposed to believe in like manner every doctrine so revealed. But if, amongst such doctrines he should make selections, and receive some because he thinks them more rational than others, and reject those which he conceives to be not so rational, then he places his reason upon a tribunal to decide regarding the truth or falsehood, or rather the probability or improbability of those doctrines which have been revealed. His opinions are founded upon the decisions of his judge, to which he has submitted the doctrines. This is not faith: for although some of the revealed doctrines might have been received, others are rejected; and belief is founded upon the authority of him who revealed, but upon the opinion of the judge who made the selection.

Suppose even, by accident, that this man's reason should decide [that] all these doctrines are certainly true, or, he finds their truth to be extremely probable, and upon this ground he receives them; this is not faith, for the foundation of faith is the authority of God—but here the foundation is the authority of human opinion. Thus, the actual belief of all the doctrines might not be faith. Faith must be belief founded upon the divine authority, not upon human opinion. The disposition to believe all that God has taught, is not actual faith, but it is the preparation for faith. When the fact is then adduced, that God revealed certain doctrines, the mind examines evidence for the truth of the fact, to decide the question. "Did God reveal this doctrine?" If the evidence is sufficient to establish the fact that he did make the revelation, the person who has the sincere disposition will immediately believe without previously submitting the doctrine itself to the tribunal of reason; being perfectly satisfied that if God revealed

it, it must be true, and knowing that human reason might err, but God cannot deceive.

Hence it is clear that between persons who hold our principle of faith, there can be no division, particularly in those circumstances which exist in our church, where there is a perpetual and manifest tribunal to testify the fact, that God did reveal certain doctrines, that he did not reveal other doctrines. It is also very clear that unity cannot be expected amongst even the best informed persons who make the approbation of their private reason a prerequisite to the belief of any doctrine, because their opinions differ as much as countenances do, and are perpetually changing in a greater or less degree in even the same individual, so that from the declarations this day, you cannot with certainty tell what will be their belief twelve months hence. This is not unchanging faith: it is fluctuating opinion. It would exhibit God revealing as many systems of doctrine as there are individuals, and contradicting his own declarations as frequently as you would find those individuals contradicting each other. It would ultimately lead to the conclusion, that in religion we can have no certainty of truth, it would make divine faith, nothing more than human opinion, and inevitably produce perfect indifference as to [the] truth or falsehood of revealed doctrines. Revelation in this case becomes altogether useless, and faith no longer would be found, for men always abandon belief when they can find no certainty.

Allow me to thank you again for drawing my attention to that distinction which I overlooked, and to amend my definition by taking in its stead, that which has the sanction of at least eighteen centuries. Faith is the belief upon God's authority, of those doctrines which he has revealed. All those doctrines might not be known to the believer, but it is sufficient for him to believe those which are exhibited to him, provided he has the sincere disposition of believing every other doctrine which God has revealed, as soon as it shall be also exhibited to him. The person who is invincibly ignorant of the truth might have this disposition, and where the disposition exists, the moral crime of infidelity is not.

But I fear, Right Reverend Sir, that this disposition is not so general, as charity would desire. However, we cannot inspect the minds of our fellow-mortals. It would be rash and presumptuous for us to pronounce upon the state of individuals. To God they stand or fall: he will decide their fate and ours. Let us then hope for more than our fears would suggest. The general principle is undoubtedly true. Without faith, it is impossible to please God. May that God, in

whose hands are the hearts of men, mould them into faith, and fill them with charity, is a prayer in which I know, Right Reverend Sir, you sincerely join with,

Your brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTERS ON POLITICAL MEASURES ABOUT IRELAND

Addressed to Daniel O'Connell

[The ensuing series of letters was addressed to Mr. O'Connell by Bishop England, to expostulate with him on his yielding his support to certain measures proposed in connexion with the Act of Catholic Emancipation; one of which was the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholders of Ireland; the other, the pensioning of the Catholic priesthood by the crown. The letters were published in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, for 1825.]

LETTER I

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 8, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My Dear Friend:—I have waited until the account of the failure of your hopes reached me. Having now ascertained that the British House of Lords has rejected the Emancipation Bill, I address myself to you. To you who know so well my convictions and sentiments, upon the great question of your rights, it will be subject of little wonder to learn, that I have been more gratified at the failure of this bill, than I would have been at its success. I believe you differ with me in the conclusion, although I have no doubt we agree in principle. My object in thus publicly addressing you, is to show to those who may read what I publish, in what we differ, and where I conceive you have greatly mistaken, or where I am very much in error. As regards me, placed where I now am my views, my opinions, and my acts regarding my native country are matter of no moment, yet still I will not yield to you in love of Ireland. Not so with you; every thought, opinion, or act of yours, is important, has great influence, and in a certain crisis, might determine the fate of Erin. When I address you then, I have in view to rouse you, by our former ties and still subsisting friendship, to examine carefully which of us is wrong; when I call upon you thus publicly it is to induce some of our former fellow-labourers, from whose memory my name is perhaps not yet obliterated, to guard their judgments against the influence of your name, which they would be ungrateful if they did not revere. But though you are my friend and their benefactor, your judgment is not infallible. And

I trust I am able to say with justice of myself, *amicus Plato, amicus Socrates, sed magis amica Veritas.* A further object which I propose to attain by publishing at this side of the Atlantic, is, that as the question of Irish wrongs begins deeply to interest the people of America, they may be able to learn the true state of the question, and not be misled by the garbled extracts which many of our editors make from the dishonest publications of the British press. You can have no idea of the very imperfect notions which men, otherwise extremely well informed, have of the religious and political state of Ireland.

You are fully aware that I have had equal opportunities with most others of knowing all the bearings of the Catholic question: that I had better opportunities than many others of knowing the state of the freeholders. I know their misfortunes, their temptations, and their conduct. Few could know as well as I did what sort of men were the Catholic clergy, and you and I have not unfrequently conversed upon the subject of their being paid salaries by the crown. The few years which have passed away since I sat with you at the same board, took part in the same debates, and since we both made habitually those topics the subject of our anxious thought and confidential communications, can not have made so great an alteration in their circumstances as to have rendered me unfit to question you a little regarding their present state, and your late conduct.

There are three topics of matter. 1. The relief of the Catholics. 2. The modification of the elective franchise. 3. The payment of the clergy. There are four descriptions of persons to be contemplated. 1. The Catholics of the British Empire; perhaps we had as well confine our view to those alone of Ireland. 2. The Irish nation, or rather the Irish province of the British Empire; *fuimus Troes.* 3. The government of Great Britain. 4. The people of the British nation.

The papers here have represented you as anxious for the relief of the Catholics; indeed it would be strange if you were not, it would be strange if I was not, it would be strange if every Catholic was not, if every lover of Ireland was not, if every lover of civil and religious liberty were not, if every just man were not. You sought it now upon that principle which always led you to seek it, and were I to make an unnecessary and profane oath as did that ill-advised and infatuated Duke of York, the Bishop of Osnaburgh, I could upon the most solemn and sacred pledge aver that I have never known any Roman Catholic seek it upon any other principle. The principle is that of the great, good, venerable, liberal, and charitable Protestant Bishop of Norwich. A principle which, as you have frequently expressed yourself, would

give emancipation to the Catholic in Great Britain, (let me add in North Carolina and New Jersey,) to the Protestant in Spain, and to the Christian in Constantinople. The principle that although God will in another state of existence punish the criminal unbeliever, he has given to no man, to no body of men, power to punish him in this present state of existence for mere disbelief of doctrine. But that he has left conscience free as regards society, though bound as regards himself. This is the principle of religious liberty, not the principle of irreligious licentiousness. Persecution has frequently made hypocrites, I doubt whether it ever made a convert. Hypocrisy is a crime of the highest order, and though instances might be adduced where persecution made converts, the means should be lawful before they could be applied to produce the effect.

The relief bill brought in by Sir Francis Burdett, which was passed by the British House of Commons, and lost in the British House of Lords, was a bill which would, if carried, indeed have emancipated the Irish Catholics, brought great blessings of tranquillity, contentment, industry, and happiness to Ireland; perhaps it might not have answered the purposes of the British government, but it would undoubtedly have strengthened and comforted the British nation. Was this the only measure contemplated, every good man would have desired its success and would have regretted its failure. But to confine our views to this bill would be looking at the question very imperfectly; it was but the first of three terms of a compound sum: at first view or to the casual observer, the parts appeared separable, but upon closer inspection the delusion was apparent and the crotchets of the statesman bound them inseparately together. We must not then view the benefits of the one without examining the evils of the others; the deduction to be made by the second quantity, which was negative, might be greater than the positive amount of benefit conferred by the first, and although the third term was positive too, when examined it might be found to result in the bestowing of positive evil. One of our American sages relates of himself, that when a boy, being very anxious to procure a whistle, he thoughtlessly gave to an urchin who observed his anxiety, considerably more than its value. Young Franklin was amused for a time with the sounds, but when the charms of novelty had vanished and he had made some inquiries, he discovered that he had given a great deal too much for his whistle. Believe me, my friend, Mr. Canning observed your anxiety, and he knows very well how to sell a whistle.

The newspapers stated that you were favorable to the bill for

disfranchising the forty shilling freeholders in the counties, and making the lowest qualification in those counties, ten pounds yearly freehold interest. What a crowd of times and places, and persons and conversations, and speeches and consultations, rushed upon my mind! I knew what the British press was. I know one of its principles was to vilify, to traduce, to caluminate, and to misrepresent you, and every one who stood on the same side that you did, and to bepraise, magnify, and extol all our opponents from our positive enemies, the Duke of York, the Dublin aldermen, Lord Bandon's little corporation, and the 'prentice boys of Derry, up to our superlative enemies, Mr. Canning, and him whom it would delight to have maces laid before him upon the Irish velvet cushion. Believe me, my friend, I felt convinced that this press, still nearly, if not altogether the same, as it was five years ago, had misrepresented you, and I almost felt warranted from my recollections, to assure the editors here, that there must have been some very extraordinary mistake. My Irish papers were rather longer than usual, due; at last they arrived. I found a letter of yours, complaining that you had been misrepresented. I began to feel satisfied, I took up another paper and I found what I sought, our friend, John Lawless' letter, complaining, as I would have done, had I believed as he stated. I looked for your examination, I read your well known principles in your answers, that you preferred universal suffrage. I have seen it in full operation; like every other system it has its evils—but it is far better than I thought it was when I was in Ireland. The advantages are greater than we used to rate them, and the evils fewer and lesser than we used to admit into our calculation. I was pleased when I found you speak your former sentiments. Yet I found Lawless pertinaciously fastening upon you, and you endeavoring to shake him off and to keep the people quiet. Yes! to keep the people quiet. I recollected the Divan. You cannot forget the Divan. You know the prudent portion of the natural leaders induced you to join with them in close meetings, to do the people's business without the people's consent, even in a manner which the people did not like, against the people's will. But we soon brought you back to the agitators; you were too honest to remain with the natural leaders. I must inform my American readers, that the natural leaders were a number of Catholic gentlemen, whose fathers had been more fortunate than some of their fellow Catholics, in keeping a portion of their property, preserving their titles of nobility, or acquiring property, recovering nobility, or attaining to baronetage, whilst their less fortunate fellow-sufferers endured the loss of everything, except their religion and their honour, and per-

haps their recollections. The sons and survivors of the more fortunate, though infinitely less numerous portion, formed a sort of Catholic aristocracy, and not content with being always complimented by the people with the first place in their affections and esteem, and preferred to the men of sound sense and strong nerve, whom the people made their associates, the natural leaders affected great prudence and moderation, and in proportion as they were permitted to visit the clerks of the lord lieutenant's secretary, they were observed to dislike the agitators, as they called their associates. They at length withdrew from the agitators; the government presses praised the natural leaders; their superlative enemies, that is, the *soi disant* friends of the Catholics, shook hands with the natural leaders, and were shocked at the rudeness of the agitators. A few close meetings of the seceders took place; though you, my friend, were the prince of agitators, you were induced to attend. Your motives were good. The people were astonished to see you at those close meetings which they called the Divan. Indeed, if my recollection serves me right, you told me you scarcely were conscious of your personal identity at those meetings. But you discovered that their principle and ours were essentially at variance. We both sought emancipation; this was the object of the agitator; this was the object of the natural leader. But we disagreed in this; the agitator would give nothing but gratitude and loyalty to the government which would do him justice; the natural leader would give something else: the one begged for his right as a boon, and would be grateful for what would be accorded. He said, "all is due, but I shall be grateful for anything which you bestow; you shall have my fidelity and my thanks; I have no more to give." The other asked in the same way, but added, "besides fidelity and gratitude, I am ready to go as far as I can, in taking something from popular rights, and adding this to the prerogative of the crown."

You could not betray your country, you would not do this. One or two of our little poets sung; you recognized the notes; your soul became enamoured with the melody; you fluttered round your cage; you found an aperture, and we soon heard you warbling your harmonious effusions full of life and joy, and the pride of liberty in our own green bower.—These days, my friends, were days of trial, but they were days of pleasure too. My eye fills, my heart grows soft, and I fancy myself thousands of miles hence, when memory brings me back amongst you. I recollect the cold prudery of the heartless Judge Downes, when he committed murder upon Irish-English, and solemnly told a jury, upon his oath, that pretence and purpose were synony-

mous in Ireland, and a Dublin jury swore that his lordship's inconsistencies were good grammar; though you know the jury was a selection of your beggarly Dublin corporation, who would not have committed even a venial sin, in the breach of every rule of Louth's grammar, because *nemo tenetur ad impossibile.* I recollect Lord Manner's solemn visage. . . . Even Mr. Saurin glides before my eye in the domination of ascendency, in the semblance of evangelical meekness; but his distended bag yawns like the insatiable grave, and desires to bring down all that dared to aspire to freedom, into the same prison-house with the beggar and the vagrant, and the thief and the felon, to prove that all men are equal: and that the law is just which says, that he who will not swear what he does not believe, shall be persecuted, whilst the perjurer shall be his judge. Yes, in all this there is a comfort which no one can describe; but which the victim of such men feels. You, and I, and our associates, have felt it, when in the disquisition of our wrongs we measured how far principle extended, and drew our line beyond which no one was to go, within which no stranger was to be admitted. Each of us was prepared for his dungeon, because no one of us knew who would be its first tenant. And the triumvirate to which I have alluded, together with Mr. Peel, charitably intended its benefit for us all. When, in such a time as this, Daniel O'Connell was teaching me the nature of feudal tenure, the origin of freehold, the mode in which it might be acquired, secured, and extended. When our vessel was just settling down upon the quiescent sea, the storm having wasted its fury, the waves having nearly subsided; when our flags and sails and smaller cordage had been torn from our masts, and those masts themselves had been kept in their place, only by the newly acquired bracings of the elective franchise, what would Daniel O'Connell have said to the man who would request of him an axe, that he might cut away some of those shrouds and stays, which had withstood the fury of the tempest, in which our royals, and topgallants had been blown away?

You told the committee that you preferred universal suffrage. Granted; but when you found your superlative enemies about to give Catholic emancipation, and to diminish popular rights, and when the vigilant Lawless called upon the people to protect their rights, you told the people to be quiet. I repeat, this reminds me of the Divan. I cannot reconcile it with your duty, with your character. I must put it more plainly to you, but still be assured of the affection of your friend,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER II

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 15, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My Dear Friend:—I assume that you knew the bill to disfranchise the forty shilling freeholders in counties would be brought into the British legislature if the emancipation bill were introduced; and that if the latter was enacted, so would the former. I assume that you were not only silent yourself, but that when our friend Lawless called upon the people to resist this bill, you told the people to be quiet. I assume, therefore, that you considered Catholic emancipation to be of more value than the possession of the elective franchise in the counties by forty shilling freeholders, even as they are now constituted. In thus stating the case I give you all the advantage, because I candidly believe you did say that the forty shilling franchise as now held in the counties, was an evil; and that if no emancipation were to be granted, it would be right to change the qualification. I differ with you upon two points. First, I believe the loss of the franchise would be a greater evil than would be compensated for by any species of emancipation, even simple repeal, which would be the most perfect. Secondly, I do look upon the possession of the forty shilling franchise in counties, as now it exists, to be a greater good than the modification to ten pound qualification.

The solution of the first difficulty will principally depend upon the decision regarding the second question. We will therefore take that question first. You know better than I can express, the vast difference between theory and practice. Originally the distinction, in Great Britain, between freehold, and chattel, and copyhold estate, had in it something intelligible to even a plain mind. The copyholder was a villain; the cultivator of the soil who, during a certain number of years, paid his rent for the leave to cultivate and take away the produce, was little better. Neither of those was the freeman of Magna Charta. The first was but another modification of what I see here every day amongst our coloured population. But the man who held the benefice, during life, and by service becoming a freeman, was the freeholder. During his life he held and used his benefice.

Long since, however, scutage was substituted for free service,—and as this scutage was a payment in money or its equivalent, the distinction between the mode of payment for the lands held by the freeholder, the copyholder, and the holder of real chattel, has vanished; thus, the premises are destroyed, and Great Britain, by one of her

legal fictions, lays the foundation of her elective franchise upon an illusion, an absurdity, viz., a supposition against fact. I now ask you in sober sadness, when the law is founded in such fiction, can you reconcile the consequences of this fiction to reasonable fact? You must expect practical folly to be the consequences of such fiction. Hence, you must not look for anything reasonable in the British mode of voting. The distribution of the right to vote is capricious, the result of fiction, absurdity, and injustice.

You will be able to judge how I recollect your lessons, when you shall have read my explanation of Irish freeholds for my American friends; and laying aside the legal technicality, inform them of what is actually the state of things,—so that by their knowing exactly what an Irish freeholder is, they may be able to determine whether the disfranchisement of the forty shilling freeholder would be an evil or a benefit; to whom it would be useful, to whom it would be injurious.

In Ireland, formerly, lands were held by *tanistry*. The tanist, or chief of a clan, held all the land belonging to the clan. He distributed offices, and gave to the officers certain portions of the common stock. When the English, partly by fraud, and partly by force, got possession of the land, they abolished the customs of tanistry, and held the land from the kings of England, according to the Norman fashion. This Norman fashion, which was the feudal custom of Normandy, was introduced into England by William the Conqueror, in 1060. We have, then, to see its nature. All the land was vested in the king. He gave it in parcels to his dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts, and barons, upon the condition that each of those would do him a service becoming a man of his condition,—and so long as he or any of his heirs male could be found who would do his duty, the freehold was to vest in such males descendant; but should there be no male descendant of the original grantee capable of doing duty, the land was to revert to the king,—that is, was to be escheated or to go into his fisc or treasury, until the king should give it to another who would do that duty. The duty was such as became a man, and this was the reason that the descent was confined to the males.

Upon the abolishment of *tanistry* in Ireland, this feudal title was established. The possessions were generally large, and the service light; and the person holding thus was said to hold of the crown, or as in fee. Thus, holding as in fee was very different from the Anglo-Saxon allodial tenure; because the Saxon, who held by allodial tenure, was the true owner of the soil,—but the Anglo-Norman, who held as in fee, was in fact a tenant of the crown, and the king was the real

owner of the land. These dukes or leaders, marquises or wardens—that is, guardians—of the marches, or frontier lands, earls, viscounts or lieutenants of the king's companions (*vice comites*), and barons or lesser lords, were called *pares* or equal—that is, peers. In their own right they sat together with the king in his court; they were his counsel. But the services required from some of them were of such a nature as to demand the united exertions of many men; and those, men of free condition. One of the principal services was that of war; and many of the warriors required were to be horsemen, *equites*, knights, with *armigers* or esquires. To insure the attendance of such persons so as to enable him to do his duty to the king, the peer divided his estate into parcels, one portion he kept for his own domain; he then had several parcels, each a knight's fee, or sufficient for the support of a knight and his proper number of esquires; their service during life, was the payment for their land. Hence, they held by free service, the land was called a benefice, they were called freeholders. But if the peer wished to have his domain cultivated, in order to furnish necessaries, for his castle, *villani*, villains, who never went to war, but who, dwelling in villages, cultivated ground, were employed to do this. The peer, not caring to be troubled with looking after them, fixed with each what yearly contribution was expected from him; the villain paid this, and all that he gained over this was his own. Sometimes a bargain was made with the villain for a certain number of years, and at the expiration of this term, his lease having been run out, he had no claim to a renewal; sometimes the sum was fixed, and to continue so, each party being bound for a certain number of years,—but a copy of the forms to be gone through for a renewal was exhibited in the office of the seneschal or steward of the peer; and the tenant conforming to the directions of that copy, was entitled to a renewal; this was the copyholder of England. The difference between the mere villain and the copyholder consisted in this, that when the villain's term expired, he had no right of prior claim; but the copyholder had a right of preference to any other, if he conformed to the customs according to the copy: each peer made what customs he pleased, and thus the copies were always different upon different estates, sometimes different upon several parcels of the same estate.

The customs were said to be the will of the lord; and the lord's will was construed to be whether he would or not, in conformity to the copy in the office of his seneschal, a duplicate of which the tenant held. But this could not come down later than the first of Richard I., which was fixed by common usage as the period previous to which the bar-

rigy right of the copyholder stands good. Subsequently to this, no copyholder could establish a new claim. Thus, in Ireland, especially outside the pale, there could be no copyhold. In fact, I believe, there is not, and cannot be, a copyholder in Ireland.

The other freeholder imitated the peer frequently in letting his ground, or part of it, to a villain, for a certain yearly rent. And thus we now perceive that, after some time, there were, the peer who held of the king, the knight who generally held of the peer, but sometimes of the king himself—the esquire, who generally held of the knight, though sometimes immediately of the king or of the peer. The peer was the king's hereditary counsellor; the knight and the esquire were also freeholders. Those who held as knights or esquires, held during life, and could not alienate their land, but could let it to be cultivated at a certain rent for one or more years. To hold and use the land during their lives was in them, but they had not dominion of the land. It was to them a benefice, not allodial possession. The cultivator of the soil who paid a yearly sum to the freeholder could not give a freehold title—but he might let or sell the chattel which he had, viz., a right during a certain number of years to cultivate the soil without impoverishing the freehold, and to take away all the produce when he had paid the freeholder the sum agreed upon.

After some time, the British kings preferred raising standing armies, which they paid, to calling upon the peers to furnish men—and commuted the service by men into a service by money; and the peers also got from the knights and esquires, money instead of service. Thus, all land held by deed for one or more lives is freehold, but no land held for a term of years is freehold; for the man who holds by copy, or for a term of years, is still considered as a villain. His property, even if it should amount to £50,000 per annum, is chattel,—but a freeholder has a more honourable tenure. The right of voting was, in feudal times, confined, so far as regarded landed property, to the freeholder, and so it continues. We have, my friend, often spoken of the folly and the absurdity of this custom. But we shall soon see some of its cruel injustice.

In process of time the great landed proprietors leased out the principal portion of their land for rents in money. A peer who held perhaps forty thousand acres, kept one thousand for his demesne: his tenants occupied the remaining thirty-nine thousand acres. Much of this was leased out to rich persons, who, when the peer wanted money, gave him a considerable fine, and were charged with only a low rent. If the person who paid the fine desired, as he generally did, to have

a freehold, he got a title during lives, renewable for ever, upon the payment of a trifling sum at each renewal. This was equivalent to a perpetuity, but it left the property vested in the peer, and gave a perpetual benefice to the tenant, who always had, by virtue of his covenant, an indefeasible claim to the renewal upon the performance of the original stipulation. Thus the quantity of freehold property in Ireland would have been immense had there been no check put to its acquisition, because almost all the land had been confiscated and granted, as in fee simple, to new possessors subsequently to this change of service into rent: and persons taking from those who held as in fee simple, would have preferred a freehold to a chattel interest. Besides several advantages in a pecuniary point of view, the right to vote for members to serve in parliament, and at the election of coroners, was attached thereto. You know, however, the manner in which Catholics were prevented from obtaining their fair share of this species of property; this I shall afterwards examine.

After some time freeholders were classed according to the value of their freeholds. 1. Those who had an interest worth fifty pounds a year and upwards. 2. Those who possessed an interest of twenty pounds a year, but less than fifty. 3. Those who possessed an interest of forty shillings, but not twenty pounds yearly. To these were to be added rent-chargers, that is, persons who, by a covenant, were entitled to claim a sum of money, yearly, from a freehold during a life or lives: for this too was a benefice, the claim must be upon the freehold not upon the freeholder; and the amount of the rent-charge must be deducted from the value of the freehold, and the other charges to which it is liable must be subtracted before the freehold can be rated and classed. The law finally regulated that no rent-charger could vote except he possessed, at least, a claim for twenty pounds yearly; and no freeholder, except he had a clear yearly interest of forty shillings at the least, above all charges payable out of his freehold; it also required that he should produce his title in an open court of magistrates once in seven years, and that the rent-charger should produce his title in like manner, and the freeholder make affidavit of the nature of his mode of tenure, whether by dwelling upon, by tilling, or by grazing, and that he did not procure his title fraudulently, nor in exchange for a freehold in any other county. The clerk of the court indorsed the deed so produced, and registered it, and the freeholder was not permitted to vote until after the expiration of twelve months, and he was then liable to be examined upon oath as to all the facts and the continuance of their truth, and as to his not having been bribed or led

to expect any reward for his vote. Neither the twenty nor fifty pound freeholders were required to produce their title-deeds, but the former should renew their registry once in seven years. They could also vote in six months after registry. You and every man who knows Ireland, knows and laments that many of the forty-shilling freeholders are manufactured for elections and brought up to register without getting possession of their title-deeds: the landlord's agent takes good care to pay the fees, and to take up certificates, and exhibit title-deeds and all other documents, which he then keeps, and hurries those creatures through complex affidavits which they do not understand, and drives them up, in like manner, to vote for they know not whom. You complain of this as an evil, and think it would serve the cause of morality and of liberty to make the qualification ten pounds, instead of forty shillings. Perhaps you are right, but I believe you are not. The question is two-fold: first, as regards morality; next, as regards the purity of representation. You must forgive me for the profanation of the phrase, I shall examine this question in my next. Meantime I shall conclude this letter with describing to my American friends a scene to which I was witness on one of those days of registry.

Several forty-shilling freeholders had consulted me, and I was examining their titles to know if they could, with a safe conscience, take the registry oath. Next came on the Catholic's oath of allegiance, which I had no difficulty to tell them might be taken by every Catholic who desired to maintain the constitution and uphold the king upon the throne. I observed one man, rather aged, who looked a little serious as the clerk proceeded to read that part of the oath which abjures the king-killing doctrine; which asserts that the Pope's infallibility is not an article of faith; that no man is bound to perform a wicked act, though commanded by the church; that no man can be forgiven his sins by any pope or priest, at the mere will of such pope or priest, but that contrition and restitution are absolutely required: the first for all sinners, the last for those who have been dishonest. Here he looked quite religious and sentimental; at the conclusion he made the sign of the cross, and took the oath, and held the pen for his signature, with great reverence, bent his knee to the justices, and bowed to the clerks. A friend of his asked him what he thought of the place—"I never was in a court before," said he, "and always feared to come, because I was told it was the devil's house, and that all the lawyers were his children; that the judges were great, but very bad men, sent by the king to hang and transport Catholics whenever they could find any law for it, but to let all the Protestants go free, whatever they might have

done. But I find it was all my mistake; a court is just as good a place as the chapel: and I cannot observe any difference in the sermons you will get here and from Father B——, except the difference between English and Irish, and between reading from a parchment and speaking without it. God Almighty bless that fine looking gentleman over; 'tis very well his gray head becomes him; why I am sure they told me he was a Protestant; but this too must be a mistake, because he told me how to go to confession and to mind the priest, and the Pope, and the bishop; but the bishop himself never told us better things about confession, and absolution, and contrition, and satisfaction; and the justices took care the sermon should do me good, for they bid him watch to see whether I would kiss the book."

I was greatly struck at the number of mistakes which the poor man made, yet he actually spoke as he thought. Two things only he knew plainly: that by swearing the oath of allegiance he bound himself to be loyal, and that his loyalty to a Protestant king was not incompatible with his faith as a Roman Catholic. In my next I shall show how many other mistakes might be as innocently made by men of this description. Meantime

I remain your sincere friend.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER III

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 22, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My dear Friend:—You would not convict of perjury the poor man who mistook for a sermon the abjuration of the calumnies with which we are assailed, and three good Justices of the county of the city of Cork for Roman Catholics, and the respectable clerk of the peace for a preacher; and a Roman Catholic preacher too. Now I ask you which of the two is a plainer oath: the oath of the Catholic's allegiance together with its appendant declarations, or the oath of a forty-shilling freeholder? I fear you will find by my last letter that I have not done my teacher much credit by my exhibition: I was a forty-shilling freeholder—I believe I knew as much as most of the same class of electors respecting the nature of my title to register and to vote—yet this oath was really one of terror, and of complexity: if I recollect rightly there were not less than a dozen different propositions to be distinctly sworn to by a forty-shilling freeholder, and I have more than once found the gentleman of the long robe seriously puzzled to make

out the exact meaning of some of the passages. I recollect the words of one part of the oath, "nor have I procured it (the freehold) fraudulently, nor has it been granted fraudulently to me," in some few of the printed affidavits, by a mistake of the corrector of the press, the words to me were omitted; a contested election came on in 1812; the candidate for whom I voted, lost his seat by a deficit of 30 votes. But had those defective affidavits been admitted he would, I believe, have been the sitting member. A very protracted debate took place before the assessor of the returning officer, in which it was contended, that all the grants, and of course the grant to the occupant, were procured by the grantee, that if it was not procured by him fraudulently, it could not have been granted fraudulently to him by the grantor: yet the decision was against us; and I am disposed to say correctly and legally. I ask how is it possible to teach all the technical legal distinctions of this affidavit to the general body of small farmers and labourers, who are county freeholders? I have doubts but its expressions would puzzle Sir William Curtis, or even a Dublin alderman, whom it would be at least petit-treason to disfranchise.

The complexity of the oath might give a well-trained, acute lawyer more exact ideas of the precise qualification; but it operates quite in a different way with the general body of the people: the multiplicity of terms, and their legal precision, creates a difficulty of arriving at the precise meaning. Thus, a great many persons take the oath with a general impression of their right to do so, but without a special knowledge of the exact foundation of that right. Far be it from me to countenance loose swearing, but equally far be it from me to assert that all who swear thus are corrupt perjurers! Many persons who swear thus hope they are right, but fear they are wrong, and with the instinctive sagacity of their character, and in full accordance with nature, when questioned by others in an ambiguous manner, they will quibble to protect themselves; their fears increase, and they will perhaps endeavour to escape the imputation of perjury by the commission of falsehood. This is a lamentable state of things, but it is not extensive and deliberate, corrupt, wilful perjury. A great remedy would be, making the expressions less complex; a man would then know what he was called upon to swear.

Now, my friend, let me remind you of another circumstance, which will operate greatly in favour of the freeholders' integrity. Thousands of the forty-shilling freeholders who scarcely, if at all, understand English, are sworn through the medium of an interpreter; their language is not that of Lord Chatham, it is the remnant of an older and

once a richer tongue, though we trace now but the indistinct shade of where two centuries since a deep shadow was distinctly marked; it is still abundantly sufficient for all the business of your peasantry, the lively repartee of their pungent wit, such as the peasantry of no other nation had. And that peasantry enslaved. It is, and I know it, fully adequate to the most glowing description, the most clear elucidation and the most pathetic appeals of religion. The harp can even now with its torn strings swell the terrific commands of the God of Sinai, louder than the pealing burst, which rolled in thunder round the summit of the awful mount, and imitate also with its soothing strains, the voice of him who told his own history, when he related the parable of the good Samaritan. Yes! my friend, and well you know the truth of what I assert. It was not in Romaic that Demosthenes roused the feelings of his hearers, but perhaps a Romaic tongue now rekindles Grecian fires: it was not in Romaic that Homer sung; but perhaps some Romaic bard now feeds the sacred flame. Shall it be imputed as a crime to the Irish peasant that though stript of his franchise, he preferred the tongue of his fathers to the tongue of his oppressor, who stript him first of his lands, next of his character, then gave him the alternative of surrendering his franchise or his religion. Your ancestor and mine gave up the franchise: we regained it without injury to our religion. And will you, my friend, now——————— No! I will not write it. Still—still—you are Daniel O'Connell—I will pledge my life for your integrity. But I will not, I cannot blind my short-sighted judgment. It is imperfect: but 'tis nature to prize greatly that with which we are not too abundantly gifted. Nature will excuse my obstinate adherence to my own views, and as I love the land of my fathers, I am prompted to publish my opinion to be weighed as it deserves by those who may deign to read. Forgive me this digression. You say "the forty-shilling freeholder must be disfranchised, because he is a perjurer." How many chances are there of mistake in the complex nature of his affidavit: in his ignorance of the origin and nature of freehold right, and why it is privileged over chattel interest: in the medium through which he is sworn; an interpreter who understands one language imperfectly, and speaks the other worse, a sort of hedge-attorney perhaps, who might know how to get through the common routine of sessions' practice by his knowledge of law as a trade; though ignorant of it as a science? The peasant knows that he has a deed, conveying to him ground at a reduced rent. Like the woman in the Eastern tale, who was to spurn the Caliph from her feet, after she would have realized an immense fortune from her basket of glass, by multiplied sales and increasing profits, his

imagination anticipates the mighty profits arising from an acre of potato ground, half an acre of wheat, half an acre of oats, a patch of flax, and the cabin. In the moment of his reverie, you would as soon lead him to swear *bona fide* that it was worth ten pounds yearly, as that it was worth forty shillings.

The landlord when inducing him to register, is kind and indulgent, grants the leave of the bog for cutting turf, the use of a horse to assist in ploughing, and does a thousand acts of civility which are all worth at least five pounds yearly to him, should they be continued, as he hopes they would. You or I would not, perhaps, believe he has an interest in it. His state is deplorable, but he is not a corrupt perjurer. He is urged to register by his landlord, by the attorney, and by his own feelings. He persuades himself that he is fully qualified.

But I have given you the advantage hitherto. I must begin to make some entries upon the other side of the book. There is a great host of forty-shilling freeholders in the towns which are in those counties; generally speaking, they are intelligent and patriotic; they know the rights and duties of freeholders, and they love their country; they could not be ten pound freeholders, not for want of property, but for want of freehold. They have abundance of chattel, but very little freehold. Allow me to enumerate: there are thirty-two counties in Ireland: in these, there are, if I recollect rightly, but five cities which would retain, by the intended bill, the qualification of forty shilling freeholders to vote. Those cities would soon lose it by analogy, if they would not lose it by trick, upon the third reading. In those counties, there are several large towns containing from five thousand to twenty thousand inhabitants each. All the forty shilling freeholders in those towns, containing, perhaps, nearly a million of souls, are to be disfranchised because of perjury and corruption. I assert that, as a general proposition, there is no perjury in those towns. I write from my own knowledge of several of them, and I assert that I have never known a better or more honest class of independent voters than the men whom this bill would disfranchise in those towns. Look to the registry of the county of Cork, and see how many of the honest and incorruptible men of the Cove of Cork would be disfranchised. Mallow was considered not to be sunk to the level of corruption and perjury; Youghall boasted of some honest men; Bantry was not sunk to a degraded state; Kinsale had some independent small freeholders, and I should be sorry to think Bandon is worse than when I lived in it. I have not gone through one-fourth of the towns of this one county, and there was no question but the county of Cork is one of the most degraded in Ireland

in its representation; but that belongs to a future letter. I now examine only the question of perjury and demoralization. There was much, but it was not so extensive as to require disfranchisement. In England, they would not disfranchise a rotten borough, every man of which was proved to be corrupt and degraded. We shall hereafter see why the British Parliament is so well disposed to protect Irish purity. Is that parliament itself very free from perjury and corruption. I recollect one of its most upright and conscientious members, whom you well know, being in conversation with me upon the subject of your claims. I asked him whether, as a good Protestant, he did not think it would be meritorious to induce us to lay aside our idolatry. "Why," said he, "we do not believe you to be idolaters." "But," I replied, "you swear it." "Pugh, pugh," said he, "you must not think that we believe it, though we swear it; the oath is a mere form which must be gone through, to take our seats." "Let me understand you," said I; "then, though every member of the House of Commons swears that we are idolaters, no one of them believes what he swears to be the fact." "Why you put it too plainly," said he; "it will sound better, and indeed be correct, if you say we must go through the form of the oath before we can take our seats." "And," said I, "the Lords must go through the same form?" "Yes." "The bishops are not exempt?" said I. "No," said he, "the bishops all go through the form." "Do the bishops believe us to be idolaters?" I asked. "No, no, you wrong them," said he; "some of them, perhaps two out of forty-three, are liberal men; and I do not believe that one of the others really looks upon you to be an idolater." Thus, my friend, we have a British bench of bishops, who go through a form of oath which they do not believe to be true; noble lords, who swear what they do not believe to be true; and a house of commons, which swears against its conviction; all shocked at a few mistakes, and some perjury of your poor wretched forty shilling freeholders, in registering their freeholds, and in giving their votes; and though Grampound and old Sarum would give godly men to this pure legislature, the great bulk of the Irish counties must be disfranchised for the mistakes of one in ten, and the perjury and corruption of one in twenty of their voters. In which eye is the beam? I look upon you to have been honest. How can I look upon the men who have corrupted their tenants, and forced the perjury upon them to be so? When I hear the friends of the ministry crying out against perjury and corruption of electors, it reminds me of the sailor, and the preacher who threatened to denounce the crew to God, as violators

of his law. "My eyes," said the tar, "but it is always the greatest rogue becomes king's evidence."

Some of the forty shilling freeholders are guilty of corrupt perjury, certainly the great minority; therefore all the forty shilling freeholders ought to be disfranchised. The British Parliament, bishops, lay-lords, and commons, all "go through a form of oath," of which they do not believe the contents to be true; therefore, as guardians of morality, and as men whose ears tingle at the very echo of the sound of perjury, they ought to punish those corrupt freeholders whom they have themselves corrupted, and the honest freeholders, who would not be corrupted by them. You and I were punished by those people, because we would not swear against our consciences. They told us that we were punished because we were not credible upon oath; their irony was cruel calumny, accompanied by heartless persecution. I need not advise you against persecution, for you are no bigot; but I do advise you against irony. The Parliament of Great Britain knows that its members are all obliged to swear what few or none of them believe, and this not in one, but in a dozen propositions. Do not then insult them by saying, that they ought to disfranchise a political body, only a vast minority of which is corrupt, a majority of which, I fearlessly say, is honest. Such disqualification might have another bad effect. It might tend to encourage perjury, because, upon a knowledge of facts, the poor people would perhaps imagine that the British Parliament had despoiled them of their rights, because there was not a sufficient proportion of the constituents assimilated to the representatives, in their mode of going through the form of a political oath. Upon an abstract view of the proposal, I would say, "Do what you can to put a stop to corruption and to perjury." But, viewing things as they really are in Ireland, I say, "It is cruel injustice to disfranchise the Irish Catholic, whilst the English Protestant, equally guilty, nay, more guilty, for the British boroughs which are more corrupt than the Irish counties, are left unpunished. I will clearly show, before I finish these letters, that the correct view of this case is what I here exhibit.

Thus, I say, the perjury and corruption which, it is pretended, call for the disfranchisement, do not exist to the extent assumed; and if their existence demands the destruction of the rights of the Irish freeholder, the same cause calls for the disfranchisement of the English electors of the Irish freeman in cities, and of the pure British Parliament; and much more cause exists in each of those latter cases, than in the former. I assert, therefore, that perjury and corruption of the forty shilling freeholder is not the cause, but the pretext for

depriving him of his franchise. "I am called a robber," said the unfortunate captive of the Macedonian king, "because I can command only one small ship: but you are called a conqueror, because your spoliations are more extensive, and your means of mischief greater." There is more perjury, more venality, more corruption in your parliament, in your bloated corporations, in your large freeholders, and in your miserable little protected sinks of malevolent bigotry, your small Orange freemen, in a tenfold ratio of their numbers, than in the forty shilling freeholders. If then hatred of corruption, detestation of perjury, and love of integrity, be the motives of the destroyers of franchise, why not begin where the evil is most palpable and most desperate? I know you would, if you could. This attack upon the forty shilling freeholder did not originate with you; but you ought to have withstood it. You ought to have acted as Lawless did.

But, would not raising the qualification to ten pounds, put a stop to this evil, or at least diminish it? No: I do not think it would. You are fully aware that the men who would manufacture a forty shilling freeholder, would be as well disposed to manufacture one of ten pounds; and the man who would be corrupt enough to swear against the fact that he had the value of a shilling, which he had not, would be disposed to swear the same to any amount. The perjury and the corruption do not consist in the sum, but in the disposition. The only effect would be, to diminish the number of honest votes, and to diminish the whole number of voters. The proportion of honest men who would be disfranchised would be greater than that of knaves who would be kept away. This is not mere speculation.

Previous to 1793, when the elective franchise was restored to Catholics, none of the upright, conscientious Catholics could vote; but, as I am informed, a large portion of the offscouring and dregs of the body always were employed to personate Protestant freeholders, and I am told that any corruption which was known since, was purity compared to the profligacy of the preceding period. I have a very faint recollection of a contested election in the county of Cork before 1793; I recollect only two circumstances. I saw the successful candidates chaired, and I shall never forget the public and continued exclamations against the perjury, corruption, and profligacy of the agents and pretended freeholders. I have since then witnessed what was said to be the worst species of malpractices used at elections; and I uniformly heard all those who were older than me say, that they were not in any way an approximation to the corruption and crime which was usual before the restoration of their rights to Catholic forty shilling free-

holders. Thus, as far as the examination of principle and of fact, and the comparison of what now is, with what was before 1793, can lead me, I am decidedly of opinion, that changing the freeholder's lowest qualification to ten pounds, would not benefit the cause of morality. I have no doubt that such benefit was not amongst the objects of those who proposed it. I shall endeavour, in my next, to show that it would be most detrimental to civil and religious liberty in Ireland.

Believe me to be, my dear friend,

Yours, very sincerely,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IV

CHARLESTON, S. C., July 30, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My dear Friend:—Since the date of my last letter, I have had a considerable addition to my news from your side of the Atlantic. Indeed, I know not whether I am more mortified or gratified by the contents of the large packet which lies before me. Your conduct has disappointed me. But the principles upon which you and I used to agree, and which I would still hope you entertain, are ably vindicated against yourself. I thought that you and I were more assimilated in our opinions respecting freeholders, than Mr. Hutchinson was to one of his humble constituents, yet he has defended the rights of the forty shilling freeholders, but you told the people not to defend themselves. I feared Mr. Brougham did not know Ireland well enough to have been able to attempt her protection as he has firmly done. I have not been disappointed in Sir Francis Burdett. He does not know Ireland, he could not know it, though he travelled through it. Yes! just as some of your travellers hurry through a few of our states, at this side of the world, and then perhaps innocently belie us to Europe, actually thinking they know what they have had no opportunity of knowing. When Sir Francis Burdett travelled through Ireland, I was a parish priest in that country, and I know well his informants. I thought he might desire to know the state of the country, but I saw that he could not—the why, it boots not now to state. I therefore then did, and do now consider his hunt through Ireland, amused as he was by a piper, and misled as to who were the ancient owners of the castles of Kerry, to have been a serious evil. Instead of acquiring any knowledge, he perhaps "had a sack thrown over his head," and left poorer respecting correct information than he was upon his landing. Mr. Plunket,

I always thought would act as he is acting. But, you,—you, who in your examination before the committee, said such fine things about the benefit of a vote to a forty shilling freeholder—you, who upon the principles of civil liberty, professed yourself opposed to any new encroachments by the executive and favourable to the extension of the rights of people! I am astonished. But, you think ten pound freeholders will better secure popular rights. I am glad to be spared the pain, the mortification of arguing against you this question upon general principles. That has been well and ably done by Mr. Ensor, and by others. I am happy also to be relieved for the same reason from contrasting yourself with yourself, that you, out of the Divan, might refute yourself in the Divan. I know well the freeholders in what is called their most degraded state, and I shall answer you by facts, and as briefly as I can.

The jet of the objection is, that the poor freeholders are, in fact, but the slaves of their landlords, and have no will of their own. That in reality the large proprietors can make them vote as they please, and that permitting the continuance of such miserable shadows of freemen is a delusion, that it is destructive of civil liberty, for it enables large proprietors to make bargains for those men's votes, and thus a few rich men and not the people, will be the electors, and those few rich men are easily bought over, and thus the middling and substantial voters are overpowered, and able to do nothing.

The objection assumes. 1. That the forty shilling freeholders have no will of their own. 2. That the freeholders of high qualifications have their will more independent, and would be less likely to obey their landlords. I shall dispose of those two suppositions before I take the other assumptions of the objection. In your own evidence, given upon oath, you are stated to have said that the forty shilling freeholder was to be courted for his vote. Men, who have no will of their own, need not be courted. In plain fact they are courted, and you know a landlord in Ireland, seldom courts where he can command. What say you to the county of Dublin? Had the forty shilling freeholders in that county a will of their own? You may call some cases of this sort exceptions; I assert they are not. And I presume to say that I know as much of the nature of their will as you do, and more of it than almost any man whose evidence, as taken before the committee, has appeared on the papers. I know more of it than does Anthony Richard Blake, Esp., chief remembrancer of his Majesty's Court of Exchequer in Ireland, who, being sworn and asked, "Are you

a Roman Catholic?" answered, "I am," and amongst other very strange answers, gave the following.

"Have you ever considered what amount of qualification for the exercise of the elective franchise would suit the present state of Ireland?—I am speaking entirely with reference to the leaseholders; and speaking with regard to leaseholders, I may, perhaps, be considered too aristocratical in my notion, but I should say the qualification ought to be to the extent of twenty pounds a year.

"Do you think, generally speaking, that the forty shilling freeholders exercise any free choice at elections?—My opinion is, that they have none.

"How do you think they are controlled?—I believe they are controlled either by an absolute landlord, or by the sort of interference through religious feelings which I have already mentioned.

"Can you state to the committee, the kind of control that is exercised over those forty shilling freeholders, so as to command their votes?—I can speak only from hearsay; the landlord, of course, has the power of distress; the priest or other partisan may act upon their religious feelings or prejudices.

"Do you think a considerable outcry would be raised in Ireland, if it was proposed to raise the qualification of forty shilling freeholders?—If the forty shilling freeholders were persons of independent property, exercising through their property a free choice, I think it would produce a very serious outcry; but I do not think they are persons of a description likely to have much feeling upon the subject.

"From your experience, are you able to say whether the feeling of the great body of the lower orders of the people, is strong and keen upon the subject of what is generally called the Catholic Question?—I believe it to be so; I do not think I ever spoke to a Roman Catholic, high or low, that did not betray something like irritation upon the subject.

"Do the committee understand you rightly to say, that the existence of Roman Catholic disqualification is a common grievance, which enables the priests to exercise an influence at an election?—It creates a feeling of discontent, of a religious nature, through which feeling the priest is enabled powerfully to act at elections; he is enabled to say to them, for instance, this man is against your religion, this man is for your religion; I am told, he has said so.

"You conceive, that by removing the Roman Catholic disqualification, you would deprive the priest of that power?—I do not think I should entirely; I should lessen the temptation to the exercise of it, and I should diminish the power also, by setting at rest the Catholic Question, and raising the qualification from forty shillings to twenty pounds a year, or to such sum at least as would raise the class of freeholders entitled to vote, so as to render them, in some degree, persons of intelligence and property, likely to have a will of their own.

"Would not the exclusion of all freeholders under £20 a year, exclude a great number of persons who have considerable capital on their farms?—I do not think it would.

"The committee understand you to state, that in cases in which persons swear to forty shilling freeholders, they have, in many instances, little interest, if any, in the lands; do not you conceive that even in the case of £20 freeholds, persons might swear to those freeholds, who had a very inferior interest in the lands than that?—I do not think they would; I think common decency and shame, and the

obvious means of instant detection, would operate to prevent it; a man who comes to swear to £20, must have some property in his hands.

"A man in Ireland, who would have an interest of twenty pounds, is of a totally different class from the forty shilling freeholder?—Yes.

"Would it not, in your apprehension, exclude in towns a considerable number of persons who are householders, who have not an interest above the rent they pay for their houses, to the amount of twenty pounds?—I have already stated, that I do not mean my observation to apply to towns.

"Are you not aware that a great number of forty shilling freeholders, who exercise the right of franchise in Ireland, are not of so respectable a class as voters from towns?—I consider the mass to be mere rabble."

This same aristocratical Mr. Anthony Richard Blake, would be satisfied to have the half a million of forty shilling freeholders destroyed, and their successors for ever disfranchised, to afford himself and a few more aristocrats an opportunity of going into Parliament or getting upon the bench.—Yes! read his answer.

"Do you believe that those measures which you have stated as likely to be beneficial with respect to the raising the qualification of voters, ought not to be considered as completely dependent upon being combined with their complete emancipation; that is, do you conceive that the raising the qualifications, and depriving, of course, the forty shilling freeholder of his right, could be effected without occasioning the most serious discontent, unless it were accompanied with the other measure you have suggested?—I have already, I think, stated an opinion, which must be considered as an answer in the affirmative to that question; at the same time, I should wish to understand what is meant by emancipation, in the question now put. If by emancipation is meant the universal removal of all disabilities, my opinion does not go to that extent; but it does go to the extent of representation in Parliament, and admission to the bench. I do not think, that if representation in Parliament were conceded, and the bench were open, that there would be much objection to some extent of exclusion from political office; the other exclusions, from Parliament and the bench, are the exclusions particularly felt."

Now, I assert that you have always deceived me and deceived the people, if this was your notion of emancipation. If I know you, you would heartily join with me and with the people, in keeping Anthony Richard Blake, Esq., off the bench and out of the House of Commons. I would prefer old Judge Downes for the first, and Master Ellis for the last. I know the people well: nineteen twentieths of the Irish Catholics would carry the Protestant Judge, Fletcher, to the bench, and the Protestant Christopher Hely Hutchinson to the House, and leave Anthony Richard Blake, Esq., leisure enough to obtain from heaven by his religious exercises more patriotism, and by his mixing with the rabble, if he could stoop so low, a little more knowledge of facts. But Mr. Blake says in another place, when asked—

"Supposing a lessor pays to his landlord a rent of £5 a year, he ought to be

able to get out of that property a rent of £7 a year, in order to give him a forty shilling interest in it?—Certainly.

"Do you believe that this is generally the case with respect to the lower class of freeholders?—I believe quite the contrary. In general they pay what is originally a rack-rent for the land, then they build mud huts upon it, and if they make out of the land a profit of forty shillings a year, a profit produced by the sweat of their brow, they reconcile themselves to swear that they have an interest in it to the extent of forty shillings a year, whereas the gain is produced not through an interest in the land, but through their labour.

"So that, in point of fact, when their interest comes to be examined by this test, it is not an interest bona fide of forty shillings a year?—Quite the contrary; I referred in a former part of my evidence, to cases that were before me upon receivers' accounts in Ireland; I found frequently, that a great mass of tenants who were in arrear, in consequence of holding at exorbitant rates, had sworn to forty shilling freeholds."

One word as to this, to show that here there was not perjury. During the war, all the lands in Ireland rose to an enormous rate of rent, and during that period, they were actually worth that rate. After the peace the value of land fell: most of those freeholders took at war prices, because they could not take before the war: the war commenced in 1793; and it was only in that year they were permitted to become freeholders, therefore it was impossible for them to become freeholders, except under war rents; the war rents were high, the value of the produce was high, the tenant took at five pounds, he improved, prices progressed, his freehold became worth double its rent, he could not register at twenty pounds, which would be four times the value of his freehold, but he could, at double the value, and he did at seven pounds, when it was worth ten, that is, he swore that it was at least worth less than half what it was really worth. Was this perjury? "Yes, it was," says Anthony Richard Blake, "because the man ought to be a prophet and to forsee, that all the lands would decrease in value, when no person imagined they would, and, being one of the rabble, he ought not to register what was then a fact, less at a future period, in the vicissitude of human affairs, what then was a *bona fide* interest, might become an incumbrance. And I, Anthony Richard Blake, do really find that several, who had forty shilling freeholds, ceased to have them." But the law provided already for this case, for the man was liable to be sworn when he came to vote, and asked, "Is your freehold still worth 40s. above all charges payable out of the same?" and he lost his franchise if he could not so swear. Mr. Anthony Richard Blake, says he was a perjurer: I say he was not, and my proof is this; for the men consulted me, and I always asked them, if a good solvent tenant offered them what they paid and 40s. more, they would, upon their oath, think

he offered more than the value of the place? And such was the question uniformly put by every clergyman whom they consulted: if they answered that they had no doubt but it was less than the value we told them they might register, if their deeds were legally valid. If they doubted, we told them not to register. Rogues generally do not, when they mean to commit a perjury, consult a priest whether they ought to swear. Our parishioners of a certain class, supposed we knew more of the nature of the oaths of freeholders than they did, and perhaps some might have been found amongst us, who knew it as well as did Anthony Richard Blake, Esq., we therefore took the very method which he presumes to say we did not. And when it came to the point of an election, several who had certificates of registry, and whose votes would have been received legally and easily, came to inform us that they could not conscientiously vote, because by the change of times they in fact had no interest. My heart is indeed smitten when I find a Catholic aristocrat, who evidently never knew, and cannot appreciate those good, honest, valuable men, attribute to their perjury an effect produced by the vicissitude of the times. There is no perjury in this. It is not want of honesty on their part; it is want of knowledge on the part of Mr. Blake, that has caused this most erroneous charge upon my poor maligned countrymen. . . .

I am straying from my subject. But perhaps it is as well.—Does Anthony Richard Blake, Esq., ever remember finding a fifty or a twenty pound freeholder in arrear? If he does not, I do, and I assert that in those places which came under my observation, the number of broken freeholders of this class was greater in proportion than that of the rabble.

Mr. Blake's object is that of the superlative friends, Mr. Canning and Mr. Plunkett, and so forth. And he honestly avows it: to bribe the Catholic aristocrats, with the chance of a place upon the bench, and a place in St. Stephen's, to be aided by them in keeping down the Irish rabble, and metamorphosing one of the best, and purest, and most patriotic portions of the clergy of the Catholic Church into the hirelings of a political oligarchy, noted through the world for its powerful and systematic corruption, and practical persecution.

"Can you state what effect the plan of raising the qualification would have upon the Protestant interest of the country?—I think the Protestants constitute, to a very considerable extent, the landed proprietary interest of Ireland; and therefore, in proportion as you increase the power of the proprietary interest, and diminish the power of mere numbers without property, you strengthen the Protestant interest."

Mr. Blake gave what he testified only upon hearsay, and as he

says in another place, I am told he has said so, and from the fact that the 40s. rabble were in arrears when they only got peace-prices for the produce of lands which they took at warrents. I write and testify from my intimacy with the 40s. rabble, of whom I was one, and I tell Mr. Blake, through you, and I shall soon prove that this rabble had more will of its own than the £20 and £50 aristocrats had, and that upon the score of Mr. Blake's criterion of independence, the would-be aristocrats being more involved in arrears than the 40s. rabble, had less will of their own. All this I knew. I shall not forget the chief remembrancer of his majesty's exchequer in Ireland, when I come to treat of the Irish priests.

I come next to Hugh O'Connor, Esq., another wealthy Catholic, whom I have always heard spoken of with great respect. I am more competent than he is to say what 40s. freeholders are, and what effect their disfranchisement would produce.—His examination:

"Have you ever attended a county election in Ireland?—I have, but I believe only once; it is possible that I may have been at a county election twice, but then it was only for half an hour or so; but I did once attend for one or two days. —Where was that?—In the county of Dublin.—What description of persons, in point of property and station, are the forty shilling freeholders whom you then saw vote, and whom you have seen vote on other occasions?—I took myself, from what I saw, some feeling of objection to the forty shilling freeholders; I rather lamented that there were that description of freeholders.—Do you think they are in a station of life which gives any security to the public of a fair and independent exercise of their franchise?—I think that they are not in that station of life that gives such security.—In the event of a bill being carried for the emancipation of the Catholics, as it is termed; do you conceive that it would be desirable to make any alteration in the present qualifications of the freeholders?—Very desirable, as it strikes me.— Do you conceive that such an alteration would be acceptable to the Catholics, if it formed part of a general measure of emancipation?—It seems to me that Catholic emancipation would be so great a boon, that I should think it would be acceptable.

"Should you, as a proprietor, think your own power and influence diminished, by having the elective franchise raised from forty shillings to twenty pounds a year?—My own power would not; for I have not turned my mind at all to political subjects; I have not even registered my own vote in the county in which I have an estate. My residence in Ireland is confined to Dublin. I have not seen that estate these ten years."

Now, my friend, it is plain that Mr. O'Connor is like many of our good folks, who would sooner speak upon a subject with which he is totally unacquainted, than take any trouble in political affairs. Mr. O'Connor, a leading, a wealthy, a respectable Catholic, looks for the votes of members of the House of Commons, and he who could give many votes, does not give one vote to return men who would protect their constituents. It is the apathy of Catholics, who, during ten years

or more could make several good and legal votes, and did not, that causes the Irish members to vote for the Orangemen, who have votes, rather than for the Catholic who could have votes, but on the day of election is a cipher in politics, though able to purchase half a county with his bank notes. How can we be astonished at Mr. O'Connor's strange notions, upon a subject of which he knows nothing, only that he felt an objection to forty shilling freeholders? I do not mean to insinuate anything disrepectful to Mr. O'Connor, but it was natural that he should be a little mortified at seeing those poor men so far below him in wealth, so high above him in political importance. I suppose Mr. O'Connor, attended at the county of Dublin election to give his aid and countenance to the cause of the candidate who was favourable to Catholics, and when the poor freeholders procured the success of that candidate, Mr. O'Connor would disfranchise them as a token of his gratitude!

But the extraordinary contradictions of Mr. Shiel have been to me matter of melancholy amusement. In his examination he was caught and sifted, and his endeavours to exhibit the peasantry of Ireland sufficiently acute to reason with accuracy, and stupid enough not to be able to apply the reasoning, shows me that though he might make better verses than I could, and paint his pictures to the mind's eye, as well as Barry did to the eye of the body, yet some few amongst us who have less imagination, probably are better acquainted with plain facts.

I have been during eight years intimately acquainted with the manner in which the freeholders of the county of the city of Cork, were influenced. I was not only one amongst them, but I aided in organizing them; that is, in registering them after their titles had been examined; and in consulting with them for whom we would vote; I pledge myself to the assertion, that if I attempted to dictate, I would be disobeyed by those whom I would thus have insulted; they were kind enough to place confidence in me, and when the day of trial came, they did, not only unhesitatingly, but cheerfully, as I desired, not because they found that I always acted as had been determined upon, and that I never betrayed either their principle, or their confidence. Did I but once attempt to substitute my will for the decision of their committee, I would never be able to regain their confidence.—I executed what they had determined, our consultation was secret, its result was confined to as few as possible, and I got the credit of being a powerful despot, where in fact I was but a successful agent. In this way, I knew what the freeholders were, and I do know that not a man of them would vote until his understanding had been satisfied, and his choice exerted;

generally speaking, every man of them had a will of his own; some of them often reasoned thus:—there are three candidates for two places —my principle causes me to prefer one, between the others I have no choice—but the success of a particular one might be an exclusion of him whom I would choose—in such a case I could not vote for him, but if I could safely vote for either of them, and that it was indifferent which; as I am a tenant of such a man, I shall place my second vote at his disposal; but I cannot give up my principle for his. This was not being without a will. The landlord made his display, and the man kept his principle—those are the men to be calumniated. But this was in the county of a city, and the new bill would not affect those men.—Yes, it was in the county of a city; the men whom I allude to were the lowest species of forty shilling freeholders, who were generally considered inferior to Mr. Blake's rabble; the forty shilling freeholders of counties at large.—I know the freeholders of the county were a better class in general than were those men whom I allude to. I shall show you why they could not act as well as those in the county of the city.—But not now.

There was in the county of the city one class whom it was very difficult to fortify against the dread of his landlord. *The little farmer of twenty pound freehold*, just the very qualification which Mr. Blake's aristocratic notions would mark as your independent voter, who cared nothing for his landlord. I shall exhibit why he was the worst slave of all, and had least will of his own. But this I must reserve for my next.

Yours, very sincerely,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER V

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 12, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My dear Friend:—I now return to the subject which I left unfinished in my last letter. I showed from facts, that the forty shilling freeholder has a will of his own. I wish to show, in like manner, that, generally speaking, the twenty pound freeholder has less will of his own, is more a slave to his landlord. I promised to show this by proof from facts. I shall give, in the form of a dialogue, the substance of what I have frequently listened to. A forty shilling freeholder remonstrating with one of Mr. Blake's men who had common decency and

shame, and some property in his hands, viz., a twenty pound freeholder, "a totally different class from the forty shilling freeholder."

Forty. Neighbour, why do you hold back? Why don't you come to the committee room and do as the rest of us are doing?

Twenty. 'Tis easily said; a man must consider for his family. The committee can do without me—I wish them success.

Forty. Certainly they can: and without me—but if every person gives only good wishes, there will be nobody to vote, and then we will be trodden down as they used to walk upon us before we got the freehold leases, when they used to turn us off the land, and let in the little Protestants, and the bucks,[2] and we were not considered worth the dirt of their shoes; the poor Protestants and the greatest rogues among ourselves, men that would swear to lies and take bribes, were then the best men in their esteem. But we now get civility sometimes, and we are courted, because the landlord knows the election will come about some time or another.

Twenty. Don't you know the landlord is against our committee? and do you want me to go and get my goods and stock distrained for the rent?

Forty. Surely I know as well as you do; didn't his attorney send to tell me that I owed now a whole year's rent, and that he had a mind to press me for the whole, but he supposed if I went to speak to the landlord himself at the other committee room, I could get easy terms, and he wanted to know what I was doing here. You don't owe more than a year's rent?

Twenty. No, nor the year's rent in full, but you know 'tis easier to make up five years of your rent than one year's rent of mine; and besides, if it comes to the worst, and that you lose your little interest, 'tis less evil to lose a small interest than a large one; 'tis easier to buy your stock than mine; if I was only a forty shilling man, I'd go to the committee as soon as you would. Forty shilling men can hold together and help one another, but 'tis not so convenient for twenty pounders to do so. Besides, what is the difference to us? The three candidates all promise to support the Catholic bill. One man is as good for that purpose as another. I must go with the landlord. But if I had only your bit of ground, I would not care so much, and if you had mine, you would leave your committee to themselves.

Forty. What makes the candidates all promise to vote now for the Catholic bill? They did not promise this the last time. That time we had only one candidate in our favour and the Orangemen laughed at us. Since then we made three times as many freeholders as we had then. I'll vote for the man that was with me when we were weak. Besides he'll not give his vote to have so much taxation on us; he won't vote for the man that let the soldiers loose upon us, since we cannot get out of the ground rent and rates, and tithes and taxes, more than its produce is worth; nor will he vote to take us from our little families because we happen to be too far from home to be within doors before the fall of the sun. Surely, you know there are some of our members worse than any Protestants, and this man and other Protestants are not to be sunk to a level with the landlord. Stay with us, he wants tenants as much as we want land.

I assure you, my friend, that I have frequently witnessed dialogues of this description, in much stronger language; and that, so far from twenty pound freeholders having a will more independent than those

[2] Mock freeholders who swore to what they did not possess.

of forty shillings, I believe it is generally, in the counties, quite the reverse, because they have a greater stake subject to the landlord's discretionary harassing.

Now I come to your fifty pound freeholders. They are of two kinds: 1. Those who hold as in fee; with respect to them you know they are generally dependent upon the crown for many favours, and for more expectations. Their sons and brothers are in the army, in the navy, in the church, in the public offices, and so forth. Though in the abstract they are independent, I ask you, in fact, are they not really more the slaves of their party, or of the crown or castle, than the forty shilling freeholder is of his landlord? 2. The middlemen: are they not, more generally speaking, the greatest slaves, as being most in arrears; having heavy rents; having received some favours, and expecting others; besides cringing to be permitted to hunt, and to dine, and to shoot with their betters? There are several exceptions in each of those divisions, but I know the general statement to be correct. In the counties, my impression is, that, as time advances, the small freeholders will become more independent; and that it is the dread of this which harasses Messrs. Canning and Plunkett, and so forth.

The county of Cork is the worst represented that can be; yet you will tell me it has an immense registry of forty shilling freeholders, and their will and interest are opposed to the sitting members for whom many of them have voted. Therefore, you will say it is clear they have no will of their own, and that I am in error. I shall answer by facts. Mr. Ponsonby once spoke with me upon the subject; and though I made him no promise, I privately made an essay to try whether the same effect could be produced in the county, that was in the county of the city, and by the same means. I uniformly found the 40s. interest honest, and ready to act. But I found the middlemen, who ought to co-operate, not only not willing to do so, but actually opposed to any such proceeding, and this as many of them declared to me, because they were in the power of their landlords, much more than the poorer freeholders were; some of those were gentlemen whom you well know, swaggering, independent gentlemen, who voted on the 3d of September, 1813, "that property was the standard of opinion," and who were then as aristocratic as Anthony Richard Blake is now. I mention but one county, because I write from my own knowledge, but I have been told and do believe that in several other counties the case was the same. I therefore assert—1. That the assumption that 40s. freeholders have no will of their own, is against the fact. 2. That the assumption that large freeholders are more independent of their landlords is against the fact.

Therefore the reasoning built on such assumptions is a perfect delusion.

The fact is known from experience and all the practical reasoning leads to the conclusion, that however mean his station, however apparently dependent he may be, the humble 40s. freeholder is the least corrupt part of the constituency of Ireland. Let us view that constituency —I shall give to the American to contemplate a picture which will exhibit to him the vast superiority of his simple qualification for a voter, over the complicated machinery of Gothic and Saxon and Norman institutions, subsisting in the imperfection of the blended defects of each and the combination of all rendered more intricate by fiction, so that the mind becomes bewildered, and the juggler is allowed to play with his puppets at his pleasure.

The first class of electors are the beneficed clergymen of the established church; they come in upon the tenure of the benefice during life, for the service which they are supposed to give in return is free and honourable. No man would presume to breathe a whisper that this parson is to be disfranchised, because he has no will of his own. Now, my friend, there are in Ireland, upwards of fourteen hundred voters of this class. I put the question openly: does any man in Ireland believe that two hundred of those parsons are men who vote independently? For my own part I do not believe that fifty of them do. I write it as a notorious fact, not as a charge: not as a reproach. Those gentlemen who have received their livings by presentation from lay-patrons, consider it a compliment, which as gentlemen they owe to those who presented their livings, to vote as they wish. Those who receive their livings by the gift of the crown, feel that the crown expects their votes, and also that if the court candidate will not get it, the court will give no farther promotion to the recusant, and the crown is daily purchasing the right of patronage from the proprietors, in order to increase its influence at elections.

There are eight or nine hundred other clergymen, curates and expectants, who vote with those from whom they have expectation. They are voters by virtue of their own property, or by being freemen of corporations. Now, my friend, did any person propose to disfranchise those men, though every one knows and acknowledges that not one in ten of them is an independent voter? But the aristocratic Anthony Richard Blake will say they have property, and therefore must be independent; most of the gentlemen of this last class are fifty pound and twenty pound freeholders. I care not whether a man is influenced by what he calls a gentlemanly feeling of gratitude, or by expectation of favour, or by dread of his landlord. The result is the same. He is

influenced; he is not independent. Besides this, the clergymen are swayed by all the other motives which operate upon the other large freeholders. Thus, it is a notorious fact, that no person ever expects an Irish clergyman of the establishment to give an independent vote. The government, the bishop, and his patron, all exercise over him more sway than any landlord does over any freeholder. Yet it would be considered sacrilege to touch his franchise, and you would yourself be horrified at the proposal, though you did taunt my friend John Lawless for what you were graciously pleased to call his undergrowl in defence of my *quondam* comrades, the 40s. freeholders, whom you advised to be silent, whilst Mr. Plunkett was stripping them, as he could not incarcerate you! Was this like Daniel O'Connell?—would any *quondam* fellow-agitator have acted so? I do not want to strip the clergy of their votes; but if the forty shilling freeholder is to be disfranchised because he is not master of his own vote, you must *a fortiori* disfranchise upwards of two thousand parsons. Then indeed would we have a yell of "No Popery," and "church in danger."

The next class of electors which I will exhibit, is that most highly respectable division called the men of old families and large properties.

One of those esquires could register a freehold not only of fifty pounds per annum, but over twenty thousand pounds per annum; that is, my good American readers, about ninety thousand dollars a year. Surely the aristocratic Anthony Richard Blake will not triumph; for clearly this man must be a more independent voter than a 40s. freeholder, a fellow who is not worth a greater interest than nine dollars a year. He will tell you, by the common rule of proportion that the former gentleman has ten thousand times as much sense, as much knowledge, as weighty an opinion as one of the mere rabble, because "property is the standard of opinion."

But who could influence such an independent man as this? I answer that there are very many men of this description who can not be influenced by any unfair or unbecoming means. But there are several others who have less will of their own than any forty shilling freeholder has, and what enslaves their will enslaves all the others of inferior grades in proportion.

Several of those great landed proprietors have enormous rent-rolls, but trifling incomes. Money has been raised to vast amount upon bonds bearing interest by their predecessors and by themselves for various purposes—for fortunes for the females—outfits and annuities for younger brothers, and extravagant expenses. How often does it happen that in Ireland a man whose estate produces thirty thousand

pounds yearly, pays away more than twenty thousand in interest? The appearance must be kept up, however, to suit the rank, and the means to insure this must be had recourse to. Government has vast patronage in the church, the bishopries, the deaneries, and a multitude of rich benefices. Here is provision for younger sons, and for sons-in-law, but there must be a *quid pro quo*: the court candidate must be supported at elections. Commands in the army and navy, distinctions, governorships, embassies, secretaryships, places in the revenue, on the several public boards, inspectorships, sinecures, pensions, and all the *et ceteras*. The bench, the chairmanship of counties, the offices in the courts, the places of high sheriff, attorney and solicitor-general, law-adviser and counsel to the several boards; the physician of the forces, surgeons of hospitals, regiments, and so forth; commissioners in the militia, and so forth. Here are several thousands of places all at the disposal of the crown. Viewing those, the large embarrassed freeholder says, "My poverty, but not my will consents." His family, his relations, his creditors who wish to fill those places, importune him. He is exposed to temptations which never assail the forty shilling freeholders. I put it to my friend O'Connell to say, if the latter is to be disfranchised, ought not the former?

You know too well the manner in which all minor offices are disposed of. Generally speaking, they are in the actual gift of the court member, who is bound to vote for the minister, in the House of Commons: and he gives them to twenty pound and occasionally forty shilling freeholders, or their relatives who will vote to send him to the House of Commons. Every person who knows Ireland, knows this to be the fact. Here is a picture for the American to contemplate! And the men who are thus returned to the honourable house unblushingly ask to disfranchise the men whom this compting influence can scarcely reach.

I shall now hazard an opinion and a conjecture. The opinion is: that so increasing the number of voters as to make the influenced portion the decided minority will be the most likely mode of destroying this corruption. Every increase of the number of voters will approximate to this desirable state. And every diminution of the number of voters will increase the power of the crown, and of its dependants. Suppose, against the fact, the forty shilling freeholders to be now equally influenced as the other electors, still increasing their number would be more likely to decrease the power of the crown, because a large body is less manageable than a small body; and the facts which we observe prove the principle. The crown can procure a return, with

facility, in the small bodies; but, even if through its influence it should succeed in large bodies, it is always after a serious struggle: a landlord, too, could more easily influence twenty large freeholders who live upon his estate, than he could two hundred small freeholders. When the number of voters was small, before 1793, elections were easily managed by the crown and the proprietors of boroughs; but since then the number of voters has been gradually increasing, and the electors are not so easily managed. The crown and the great landholders find their influence greatly checked; the people at large find their consequence greatly increased. The extension of the franchise, in 1793, did more to rescue Ireland from degradation than any other act could have done; and my conjecture is, that now the crown and the great landholders have combined to narrow the right of suffrage, to check the progress of popular rights, and to endeavour to regain a portion of that domination which they have lost, and to secure what yet remains. I think I see the proof of this in the eagerness with which the aristocrats who used to oppose Catholic emancipation, rush forward to petition that emancipation might be granted upon the condition of their being delivered from an unmanageable body of electors, who will not permit them to make their bargains with government as comfortably as their fathers used, when the number of voters was less and the small body was more easily managed. Here was a tremendous water-spout rising in your course, and which would have inevitably swamped your vessel, had it poured upon her; yet you were displeased with the man, who, looking ahead, fired a gun to dissipate the portentous column; because, forsooth, the demon of the whirlwind would be displeased at the report, and tell your crew that although he had them stowed under hatches, and driven your steersmen from the helm, you still were agitating demagogues; no doubt the report of such a gun was an under-growl! Alas, poor Ireland! was it not an unpardonable offence in John Lawless, to have called your children to your protection, when orders had been issued not to utter a syllable until after the keeper should have had his hand upon you and was actually turning the screws of your manacles? And have I so far forgotten the land of my birth, and the spirit of my former associates in a very few short years, as not to have been astounded at reading that in an aggregate meeting of the Catholics of Ireland, the man who thus protected his country was received with partial hissing? But let me congratulate him upon the occurrence. In every community there will be found men whose praise is censure, and whose censure is praise—I should suspect I was a traitor to Ireland,

had I been applauded by the men who shouted for the Marquis of Londonderry.

I have been tedious upon this topic, but as the people of America did not know exactly the nature of Irish freehold tenure and mode of influence used by the crown at elections, I preferred being dull and wearisome, to one who knew the facts, to being unintelligible to one who knew them not. I hope to conclude this topic in my text. And as of you I know,

"Those best can bear reproof who merit praise."

Be assured of the sincerity with which I remain,

Your friend,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 19, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My dear Friend:—I trust that it has been shown, 1. That although many of the registered forty shilling freeholders were manufactured, still the vast majority of them were, and are, *bona fide* freeholders. 2. That so far from being generally perjurers, they generally have a high respect for their oath. O, I am galled and ashamed at being compelled by any circumstances connected with you to have been obliged to write this! 3. That as a body they are less corrupt than any other class of Irish voters. No comparison can be formed between their political purity and the political corruption of the freemen of corporations. 4. That as a body they are less liable to influence, and less under its operation than the clergy, the large proprietors, and the twenty and fifty pound freeholders. Remark, I compare the aggregate body on the one side to the aggregate body on the other. I make no individual comparisons, and I also take them, in the ratio of their numbers, respectively. You may, for instance, in one barony find a clergyman perfectly independent; three or four proprietors unembarrassed, and independent, and incorruptible; eight or ten respectable twenty pound freeholders; and in this collection of twenty-five unexceptionable men, you have spirit, integrity, and patriotism. You may in that same barony produce two hundred forty shilling freeholders, one-fourth of whom are either slavish or corrupt. Yet you will have one hundred and fifty honest men, whom the bill would disfranchise. But this view even is grossly partial, because it assumes, against the fact, that through the island all the honest votes are to be found amongst the clergy and gen-

try. You may recollect the homely answer of a countryman of ours to a person who told him that his family must be very bad, as there were so many who bore his name hanged, though hanging is not, in Ireland, evidence of criminalty: "My good sir," was the reply, "there were more bearing my name hanged than were good men bearing your name, and there are now a greater number of good persons of my name living than ever were, are, or will be, of your name in the world." In the ratio of their numbers the forty shilling freeholders are the best and most independent voters in Ireland. Should this be ever read in Ireland, I am quite aware of the manner in which it will be received at the first reading; but the numbers who will acknowledge its truth will be continually on the increase as examination will be made.

But why not amend the system by destroying the slavish and the corrupt portion? Do, if you will; but begin where the evil is greatest. You say you cannot; the church cannot be touched; lay but a finger upon it, and Mr. Plunkett, the worthy son of a Presbyterian clergyman, will be actually in hysterics, and the Catholic Mr. Blake will be shocked and will need the aid of thieves' vinegar to preserve him from the contagion of democracy. Well, to give Mr. Plunkett a chance of the chancellorship, and to leave it in Mr. Blake's power to climb the bench or to creep into the Commons: Is not this house too democratical for this aristocrat? We will leave the churchmen untouched, and the large freeholders unmolested. But provided always upon the condition that they leave the small freeholders unmolested, but not otherwise. There are some evils in the system, but many of these evils arise from the unreasonable mode of continuing a feudal test, to know who is a freeman in a system where freedom and independence are not now connected with feudal tenure—*every freeman ought to have a vote.* This is the principle of the old English constitution. In the Saxon days, in the Norman times, there were villains and thralls; they were not freemen. Now your mode of ascertaining who is a freeman, is to ask does his foot touch the soil of Britain? He is free. O! I have not the spirit to transcribe, nor even to allude to the description of the beautiful vision whch presented itself to Curran's imagination, and which his ardour mistook for real fact: when he told us of the sinking of the altar and the God before the genius of universal emancipation. O, my friend, it is sickening to read so eloquent a sentence and to find how you are mocked when you come to examine the reality. True, there is no God; but there is an altar over which the demon of discord presides, grinning a ghastly smile of bitter mockery at the deluded reader of Curran's vision. This idol of my native land, begrimed with blood, sur-

rounded with halters and instruments of torture, is raised upon the rights of Ireland as a pedestal; the yells of party orgies swell the peals of adoration; human victims palpitate, and the smoke of their carcasses rises like incense to his distended nostrils. We behold those whom pestilence and famine and desolation have prostrated, fill the temple: their infuriated relatives rush to assail those who mock their woes with hypocritical distributions of Bibles and religious tracts, and thunder out their anathemas in the shape of insurrection acts, and white-boy acts, and peeling acts, and tithing acts; many of those relatives are seized and banished, the others by the use of their franchise would indeed demolish this altar, destroy this temple, and lay this spirit, and therefore it is that they who would perpetuate the idolatry would deprive them of their franchise, because, like every other worship, the worship of this demon brings profit to his priesthood.

If every man in Ireland is a freeman, why has not every man in Ireland his elective franchise! And if this be a freeman's characteristic, why will you deprive so many thousands of my countrymen of their freedom? Or will they permit it? Mr. Shiel said you could persuade them to be content after the spoliation—could you? Then they deserve worse than slavery. Would you? Your punishment ought to be more afflictive than theirs. If Mr. Shiel stated what was a fact, I thank God I do not live in Ireland. I thank God I live amongst men who value their rights, and will never listen to any person who dares to advise about even the possibility of their retrenchment. No, no! this is one of Mr. Shiel's mistakes. He has a beautiful imagination. He sees this not in Ireland, but with his mind's eye. He sees it in that space between earth and heaven; he bodies it forth in words, and gives to airy nothing a habitation and a name.

But you would not strip Irishmen of their rights; you would give the right of universal suffrage. Why, then, did you tell them to be silent? *Qui tacet consentire videtur.* Why did you scoff at the undergrowl of Jack Lawless?

But you would leave a respectable constituency. You would disfranchise thousands. You would reduce men who now have a right to vote to the state of slaves who have no vote. But there would arise a substantial class of ten pound freeholders, and there would be more comfort amongest the peasantry. Do you seriously believe this would be the result? I do not, and I found my opinion upon my knowledge of the Irish landlords.

But suppose the landlord gives a tenant an interest of ten pounds, instead of forty shillings. If it arises from the landlord's generosity,

the tenant will be under an obligation; if it arises from the tenant's industry and means, he has now the same industry, the same means. The change would be injurious to freedom; and this is the reason why all the tyrannical land-jobbers, and the aristocratic land-owners, who detest the sound of Catholic emancipation, are ready to give even emancipation at this price. Thus that they profess their opinion to be that which I have expressed. That this does more injury to civil liberty and to Irish freedom, than would be compensated for by Catholic emancipation.

But, hitherto, I have been obliged to keep one great consideration out of view, viz.: That the quantity of property in Ireland, out of which freehold interest could arise, is much smaller than is generally imagined.

You are to deduct from the surface of the island—1st. All the bishops' lands, which are held by tenants for terms of years—generally with the clause of *toties quoties*, that is, the occupying tenant has, upon certain conditions, a right to get a renewal from the bishop's tenant, who is his landlord, as often as that landlord gets a renewal from the bishop. Next, the glebe land, the college lands, and those of several corporations, which are not allowed to make a freehold. I believe this would sweep away more than one-fourth of the country, upon which no freehold can exist.

Before 1778, no Roman Catholic could take a lease of a house or land for a longer term than thirty-one years, and if the land was worth more than a trifling consideration over the yearly rent, any Protestant could, upon paying that advanced sum, turn the Catholic out and enter into possession.

But when the success of the people of America taught England that prudence, which is miscalled generosity, Catholics, upon swearing allegiance, were permitted to take leases at low rents, and for 999 years. The first relief of the Irish Catholic from his bondage is due to America, which may God enrich with every blessing! And, perhaps, were it given to us to see through the mist of futurity, we would discover that the ecstatic consolation of completing this work of philanthropy and charity is reserved for this land, whose soil teems with the blood and sweat of grateful Irish Catholics.

The Catholics, soon after the passing of this law, began to acquire real chattel to a considerable amount; and, in fourteen years, had got into possession of a vast quantity of land, under leases for long terms of years. In 1782, they were permitted to take freehold, but not to vote, for which reason they still took chattel.

This greatly curtailed the quantity of land in towns, cities, and

counties which might be made freehold, because no freehold can arise out of a real chattel. Thus, when in 1793, the French Revolution and the United Irishmen made the English government exhibit a little more mock-generosity, the Catholics could become freeholders, and were restored to their franchise except in the corporations—the quantity of land by means of which they could obtain the franchise, was greatly limited, and had, in fact, been principally curtailed by the conversion thereof into real chattel. The wealthy Protestants had the old confiscated Catholic property as in fee simple; they were all freeholders, and freeholders to a large amount: there was scarcely a Protestant above the rank of a beggar, who, if he was a freeholder, was not so to the value of twenty pounds. But the rich Catholic had made the most of his money, by giving the Protestant a large fine to reduce the yearly rent of ground which he took for a long term of years, when he could not take as freehold, or if he had a freehold, he could not vote, though he was frequently richer than his landlord, who had a freehold of perhaps two or three thousand pounds per annum. In 1793, this Catholic wished to become a freeholder, and he could with difficulty procure a forty shilling freehold, though owning real chattel to a great amount.

From those facts it is clear that there could be very few Protestant 40s. voters, and that the vast majority of Catholic voters must, for several years, be persons of that description; that smallness of freehold generally would argue poverty in the Protestant, and would by no means indicate it in a Catholic; and that to disfranchise the small freeholders generally, would be, however impartial in appearance, nearly equivalent to a disfranchisement of the Irish Catholics. The Catholic voters, I believe, are now to the Protestant voters through Ireland, in the ratio of three to one; and by this disfranchisement of the 40s. freeholders, the Catholic voters would be to the Protestant in the ratio of one to five, if we take in the corporations, though the Protestant population is to the Catholic in the ratio of one to over six. Almost every Irish Protestant either is, or has in his power to become, a voter. It is a matter of great difficulty to a Roman Catholic to become qualified. I have known Roman Catholics, whose property was worth more than twenty thousand pounds, during two or three years anxiously endeavoring to obtain, for more than its value, as much freehold property as would enable them to register as 40s. freeholders, and still unable to obtain it. If, then, it is so difficult to obtain a qualification of 40s., would not the difficulty be increased by making it five times as great? And if my views of the facts be correct, would not the ten pound freeholder, who would owe his franchise to the indulgence of his

landlord, be a worse slave than the present 40s. freeholder? And would it not be unjust to the individuals and injurious to the principle of civil liberty, and of morality and integrity, to deprive the least corrupt portion of the constituency of their right, under the false pretext of their having abused it? to take from the body of the people the characteristic of freemen, and to diminish the number of persons to be influenced, thereby creating a facility which would tempt the corrupter?

Would Ireland be compensated for these evils by Mr. Blake's aristocracy? What will you put in competition with the liberties of your country? O I am sick of the subject. Amongst the several possibilities that ever rose before my understanding, the necessity of thus remonstrating with you upon this topic, was one of the last I could imagine.

Did you not see the dreadful innovation, like some dark cloud rising in the east, obscuring the sun of your hope, darkening the prospects of your country, communicating its gloom to every countenance, collecting every kindred speck as it rose, lowering upon your liberties, as it spread upon the horizon, and threatened in the zenith; every timid man fled, every prudent man feared, every honest man bewailed, that which was likely to ensue—whilst you stood calmly descanting upon the glories of that luminary which it veiled, the innocence of its lightning, the harmony of its thunder, and the benefits which would ensue to the land after the deluge which it would pour forth should have swept away the hovels of the forty shilling freeholders and their inmates to the gulf of ruin; then, indeed, a new order of things would arise, *Jam redit Astraea.* The Orange persecutor would become charitable and kind—the middleman, benevolent—the landlord would be a protector—the magistrate impartial—the parson would be liberal—the tithe-proctor merciful—the tax-gatherer tender-hearted, and a happy race of peasants would enjoy the soil. Did you believe all this would happen? If you did, your hopes were greater than were those of your friend,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Aug. 25, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My Dear Friend:—I shall in this letter conclude my remarks upon the attempt to destroy the rights of the Irish Catholic electors. I call it the attempt to destroy their rights, because I believe I have fully

shown, that if the bill had passed, this destruction would be its inevitable consequence. Thus it would be injuring religious liberty, without naming religion; it would be injuring civil liberty, by stripping thousands of their franchise; it would be maintaining the Protestant ascendency in Ireland, without calling it Protestant; it would be the worst species of persecution, viz., persecution in disguise. Every person now points with reproof and scorn to your boasting masters, who assume to be the most liberal, whilst they are well known to be the most persecuting government in the civilized world. The South American, just emerged from bondage, is more liberal, and when he refuses to your government the right of making religious establishments in his country, for your Protestant merchants, it is because he has been informed that those merchants petition to continue the oppression of his fellow-Catholic in Great Britain; and because he sees that those merchants will, if permitted to make such establishments, deluge his country with bad translations of the Bible, and tell the people that their priests are knaves, whose religion is a sacrilegious traffic upon dirty bits of brown paper, and who give men leave to rob their neighbours, provided they share the plunder with them.

As he knows he has religion, and is not an idolator, and as he knows those vile falsehoods would create mischievous irritation, he thinks it just as well to keep that Christianity which came down from the Apostles through his fathers, as to substitute any modification thereof, which Britain or even New England can bestow upon him. But he enacts no law to deprive the people of the country of their civil rights, because they will not give up the religion of their ancestors: and this is more liberality and justice, than Great Britain has evinced since the days of Henry VIII. Is there in the world a parallel to British intolerance? The inquisitors prevented the people from making changes in religion, upon the ground that any essential change must destroy it. Britain persecutes them for not changing with her, though she says that she might err in making those changes. The Inquisition could keep all its victims in a few dungeons; Britain has not, during three centuries, ever had less than millions of victims at a time. Ireland has been one vast prison, and every member of her ascendency has been an inquisitor. I disapprove of the Inquisition. It never was a portion of our religion, as is erroneously imagined. But in the most angry times of religious acrimony, forgive me the expression, British writers have had to ransack our church for the names of a few persecutors who filled our episcopal chairs; the world has to rest but upon very few dignified names in the modern British hierarchy, who stand an exception

honourable to themselves from its bench of bishops. Britain is not insensible to this; and therefore the oligarchy which rules her, is anxious to assume the appearance of a virtue which it has not. It wishes to keep the Irish Catholics powerless, but still yearns to have the semblance of being liberal, and finding that it cannot destroy the power of a Catholic nation, such as Ireland is, without destroying its civil rights, it attempts to do both by one act; and that is, by disfranchising a large body of electors, who, under present circumstances, must almost universally be Catholics, and then in return, it will dole out favours to a chosen few, and pay the clergy, that they may aid in enslaving the people. Thus Britain will endeavour to wipe away the stigma of her disgrace, and still do the very acts for which that stigma was deserved.

Look to the history of our country, and decide by facts. I have been amused by what has been miscalled the philosophy of history—such is Hume's:—a mockery of reasoning not worthy of even the dignity of a sophism, which attempts to argue you out of truth, by supposing it possible that a fact which is related, did not occur; and discovering possibilities that motives might have been, of the existence of which there is no proof; but evidence the other way. And then without evidence, and contrary to evidence, you are upon the philosophy of history, to suppose the fact which history exhibits, did not occur, or if you cannot be brought to that, you must at least believe by philosophy, that the agent had motives which are different from the true ones. This is one kind of philosophy with which I hope never to be imbued. Some reflection has led me to study history after a different fashion. I look upon history to be a record of facts, not a system of speculation. I examine the truth of the record by the rule of testimony; where I have evidence of the fact, I believe it; where I have not, I draw no conclusion. In like manner I deal with motives and dispositions. The object of my study of history, is, to argue by analogy. My conclusions from analogy in history can only be highly probable, but where I cannot be certain, I may prudently be guided by high probability. After having studied this, I give nothing for the professions of statesmen; I judge them by their acts. Our venerable friend, Bishop Moylan, of Cork, frequently told me, during his last illness, and with serious emphasis, and for useful purposes, how little reliance was to be placed upon the British statesmen, by the Catholics of Ireland. His warning was conveyed in the relation of a multitude of facts, in which he had been too well instructed, because he and other bishops had been very often artfully deluded by great and good men, and by sincere friends. I shall never forget his dying injunction to me upon the subject.

Look then to Irish history—I pass over the acts of William and Mary; I pass over those of Anne; I pass over the cruel inflictions under George I.; the whole period of the mean and deceitful Charleses and Jameses; the atrocious times of Elizabeth, I consign also for the present to oblivion; I begin with the accession of George II. Up to this period the Irish Catholics were not deprived of the elective franchise, though by an act, which, if I am rightly informed, can only find its parallel in the old colony of Maryland, they were in the reign of Charles II., shut out of their houses of legislature, of which they were members; excluded without any semblance of law or authority, but by a simple vote of their associates; and most part of their lands having been taken away, and they being excluded from most of the corporations, though they had the right of electors in law, they did not generally possess it in fact, for want of qualification during the reigns of William and Mary, Anne, and George I. But when George II. came to the throne, Primate Boulter, who was then the chief oligarch of Ireland, observed that the number of Catholics who by law were qualified to vote, had greatly increased, and that the Clanrickarde family had been, through Catholic influence, thrown out of the representation of Galway. The family of Portumna had then become Protestant, and joined the oligarchy. But the Catholics committed a worse crime, one which Britain seldom forgives. They were then to the Protestants as five to one, and for the first time some Irish Protestants began to look to the welfare of Ireland, and to form the Irish party in support of the civil liberty of their country; against those men Primate Boulter formed the English party; the Catholics joined the patriotic Irish Protestants, and with them sought the benefit of their common country. They voted in electing the Parliament of 1727. And that very parliament in whose election they concurred, deprived them of the elective franchise, and this was done by the contrivance of the oligarchy, in a clause by way of amendment, at one of the late stages of a bill, without notice or debate. In what does this nefarious act differ from the late attempt, so far as principle and apparent object are concerned? The cases are very nearly parallel. Primate Boulter wanted no debate then. All was done without agitation. 'Tis true this late bill would not make so extensive a sweep; and Mr. Anthony Richard Blake might get into the House of Commons.

The act of George II., disfranchised two-thirds of the Irish electors; so would the bill of Mr. Littleton. I could insure you a pretty ascendency to plague you, did it pass.

But the analogy will hold still farther; at that time too, there was a

Catholic rent, the payment of which was prevented, and the association broken up. Whilst an act was pending to prevent Papists from acting as solicitors, the Catholics of Dublin and Cork entered into a subscription to defray the expenses of opposing the bill; an interdicted priest, one Hennesy, became, as all such unfortunate men will become, the accuser and defamer of his church; he informed the government that this subscription was for the purpose of bringing in Popery and the Pretender. I do not find that he added "wooden shoes." The papers of the collectors were seized and laid before the House of Commons, I know not whether in a green bag or in a red bag. After the examination, the committee reported that it appeared to them, "that under colour of opposing heads of bills, great sums of money had been collected and raised, and a fund established by the Popish inhabitants of the kingdom, through the influence of their clergy, highly detrimental to the Protestant interest, and of imminent danger to the present happy establishment." From the printed report of the committee of the House of Commons, it was manifest that this subscription for bringing in Popery and the Pretender, amounted to the enormous sum of five pounds, lawful money of Ireland! Your late association had a purse also, and was to do great mischief—under colour of procuring bills, it was to be highly detrimental to the Protestant, that is the Orange interest, and of imminent danger to the present happy establishment, which makes the most salubrious and fertile island in the world, inhabited by the most patient and laborious and vigorous people on earth, the most wretched spot of human endurance on the surface of the globe.

The liberal Protestants of Ireland, and the Irish Catholics, associated for the benefit of their country. A subscription was made; it was more than five pounds. The donation of the Duke of Leinster, one of the best of Irishmen, the mite of the labouring 40s. freeholder, the confluence of the intermediate contributions, all formed a grand national reservoir, by means of which, a nation thirsting for justice, might be refreshed even under the fiery ray of a consuming oligarchy. This was more than could be endured by the enemies of Ireland. Your association was put down; the payment of your rent prevented; but as you were not quite as powerless as your predecessors under George II., some cunning should be resorted to before you could lose your franchise. Kind words, soothing promises, valueless professions of patriotism and friendship, won upon you, and you were induced with the best intentions, to give the worst advice. To tell the Catholics of Ireland to remain quiet, until after every hope of their children should

have been destroyed, by stripping the great body of the people of the last remnant of their rights: their franchise. O! my friend, how could you have ever, not consented, for you did not, but permitted, whilst you had a tongue to speak, a finger to write, or a hand to raise—how could you have permitted the poor Irish peasant whom I know you love, that poor man who has so often borne you in triumph upon his shoulder; whose heart expanded when you appeared; whose first shout was the expression of your name; whose affection for you was boundless as his confidence; whose triumph was your fame; whose little earning was a treasure open for your application to the public good,—how could you have permitted that man to be disfranchised? And this, after he placed his money at your disposal, and his rights in your keeping?

If I know anything of the policy of the union of Great Britain and Ireland, it was chiefly devised for the purpose of destroying the influence of the Catholic electors of Ireland. Their influence was increasing, they would have gradually driven the Irish Commons to do them justice, there would cease to be a Catholic and a Protestant party, but there would be an Irish party, and that party would be the majority of the nation, comprising men of every belief. This was not to the taste of the British Cabinet. The Orangeman was told by the whisperer from the castle, the Papists have the elective franchise; their numbers are great; their voters are multiplying: your Irish Commons must soon emancipate them, unless you join our British Protestant house: in Ireland only, the Papists are a majority; in a united empire, they are a minority: consent to the union, or you will be overwhelmed. The castle told the Catholics that the Irish Orangemen were so corrupt that emancipation never would be granted by the Irish House of Commons in which those Orangemen were and must continue to be a decided majority, but that the English Protestants were without prejudice, or if they had fears, in case of emancipation, of seeing Catholics become a majority in the Irish house, they could have no dread from admitting a minority consisting of Catholics, into a united Parliament; that the Irish Commons were corrupt, venal and bigotted; and that it was only by a union with Britain that the Irish Catholic could expect emancipation. Already pensions were held out to the clergy, and the nefarious and almost simoniacal traffic was commenced. Better men could not exist than the bishops whom wily statesmen deluded. The union was effected by duping the Catholic; I once thought the Orangeman too was duped, but it is now clear he was not. It was an actual disfranchisement of the Irish Catholic by leaving him an influence in choosing only about one-tenth of the British house

in which his rights were to be now disposed of, instead of leaving him an influence in the election of two-thirds of the Irish house, which before the union was to decide upon his fate. The effect of this disfranchisement was in truth the same to the Irish Catholic, as if an act had passed disqualifying electors of that communion from voting for twelve-thirteenths of the members of the Commons House; as it must be manifest that whether you increase in certain ratio the number of members who are returned by Protestants only, or diminish the number returned by Catholics and Protestants in the same ratio, the result will be the same. But by this act both ratios were combined against the Catholic; and the hopes of Ireland were given to the keeping of eleven British and two Irish members. The Catholics could return one of the Irish and had no influence over the return of the British members.

And now the oligarchy seeks to deprive the Irish Catholic of even this moderate influence! Did not the act of union sufficiently neutralize the power restored to the Catholic by the act of 1793?

And what has the result been? You have during a quarter of a century been bowing and dancing attendance upon your masters, and how have their promises been fulfilled? But you have grown strong, and they know it. You have lately united and pressed your claims. The eye of the world is upon you and upon them. They are worried by you, but still they bid defiance to public opinion. Instead of doing you even tardy justice, they cunningly contrive to sow dissension amongst you, and endeavour to rob you of that which constitutes your strength. How often has Britain lulled you into a false security and let in the enemy upon you. But you rose in your might, broke the new cords and the ropes of sinews, and your frown terrified your foe. Your appearance was uncourtly, you were agitators, it would become you better to cast away those curling locks which indicate your barbarity and corruption. Do, pray, allow your uncouth 40s. freeholders to be trimmed off. You will then be fit to enter the royal presence of the princes of Philistia. Do you not see, the secret of your strength is made manifest? You know the source of your weakness. Why will you dally in danger? Though your hair should grow, your eyes will have been previously destroyed; in your fury you may grope for vengeance, and perish together with your oppressors. But now be prudent, and you need not dread this deplorable alternative of slavery; you need neither grind in a mill, nor shake the pillars of the state. Cherish the source of your energy; guard it as the apple of your eye; reject the blandishments of your disguised enemies; this is your maxim of safety.

But, my friend, a word more with you. The examination of the

effects of the union has reminded me of a fact. When Ireland was threatened with this calamity; when terror scowled upon the visage of every satellite of the castle; when desolation swept the fields; when the streets of her metropolis were almost empty; when the widow durst not mourn; when the orphan's eye looked in vain for that father whose name his tongue could not utter; when in such days as these traffic and barter were used to despoil the people, and the Catholics were assured by men who never kept faith with Catholics, that a united Parliament would grant what that Parliament has repeatedly refused,—one little patriotic band had the hardihood to walk boldly to the vicinity of the castle of Dublin, that in the very hearing of the agents of their country's ruin, in the face of the country, they might at least make a protest against the destruction of the rights of their country. The formidable guard with the pointed bayonet stood to prevent this band from entering the Royal Exchange; but they gained admittance. And one young man who never did, and never will yield to terror, raised his voice that day and thus addressed his fellow-Catholics.

"He said, that under the circumstances of the present day, and the systematic calumnies flung against the Catholic character, it was more than once determined by the Roman Catholics of Dublin to stand entirely aloof, as a mere sect, from any political discussion, at the same time that they were ready, as forming generally a part of the people of Ireland, to confer with and express their opinions in conjunction with their Protestant fellow-subjects.

"This resolution, which they had entered into, gave rise to an extensive and injurious misrepresentation, and it was asserted by the advocates of union, daringly and insolently asserted, that the Roman Catholics of Ireland were friends to the measure of union, and silent allies of that conspiracy formed against the name, the interest, and the liberties of Ireland.

"This libel on the Catholic character was strengthened by the partial declarations of some mean and degenerate members, wrought upon by corruption, or by fear, and unfortunately it was received with a too general credulity. Every union pamphlet, every union speech, impudently put forth the Catholic name as sanctioning such a measure, which would annihilate the name of the country, and there was none to refute the calumny. In the speeches and pamphlets of anti-unionists, it was rather admitted than denied, and at length the Catholics themselves were obliged to break through a resolution which they had formed, in order to guard against misrepresentation, for the purpose of repelling this worst of misrepresentations.

"To refute a calumny directed against them as a sect, they were obliged to come forward as a sect, and in the face of their country to disavow the base conduct imputed to them, and to declare that the assertion of their being favourably inclined to the measure of a legislative incorporation with Great Britain, was a slander the most vile; a libel the most false, scandalous, and wicked that ever was directed against the character of an individual or a people. 'Sir,' said he, 'it is my sentiment, and I am satisfied it is the sentiment, not only of every gentleman who now hears me, but of the Catholic people of Ireland, that if our opposition to this injurious,

insulting, and hated measure of union were to draw upon us the revival of the penal laws, we would boldly meet proscription and oppression, which would be the testimonies of our virtue, and sooner throw ourselves once more on the mercy of our Protestant brethren, than give our assent to the political murder of our country; yes, I know—I do know, that although exclusive advantages may be ambiguously held forth to the Irish Catholic to seduce him from the sacred duty he owes his country; I know that the Catholics of Ireland still remember, that they have a country, and that they will never accept of any advantages as a sect, which would debase and destroy them as a people.' ''

Those Catholics joined with that young patriot in his protest. *You* are that young man; fear could not operate upon you. I have always honestly addressed you; I must have no false delicacy upon a public question, in which the dearest interests of our common native land and our common religion are deeply involved. I will use the boldness of my friendship and love of my native land and my religion, even with the pain which it gives me to say, that I believe you were seduced to hesitate, by men by whom you were surrounded, by men whom I know, by men who would not stand by you at the Royal Exchange on that day; by men who know not the meaning of the word *country*, but who well know the meaning of the word *court*. Do, my friend, let Daniel O'Connell, in 1826, upon this question, maintain the principle which he so nobly sustained in 1800; the news will cheer many an Irishman who is numbed near the pole, or who glows under the equator; and the name of his friend will still be surrounded with the affection and the prayers of

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VIII

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 2, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My Dear Friend:—There was a time when I could have written more freely, and under less restraint than I now can, upon the subject of the present letter. My membership in the Irish Church has terminated; not that I loved my country less; not that I left the communion of its hierarchy; not that I preferred any other field for my labours; not that I was ambitious of situation: my rank is indeed more elevated, [but] my situation more depressed; the comforts of my ministry materially diminished, and the difficulties of discharging its duties materially increased. This, and more than this, I anticipated, and my anticipations have been realized. An imperious sense of duty has separated me from the Irish Church, and will continue that separation; my affections

are still with it; my eyes are still turned towards it; I rejoice in the glories which encircle it, and I deeply feel for its afflictions: yet I am not at liberty to interfere in its concerns. I must write of its affairs as a stranger, as one with whom it holds communion, but who is not permitted to interfere in its special discipline. Were my place lower in rank, I might write more freely, and my writing be passed by; but, holding an equal rank with the prelates whose right and duty it is to regulate the local discipline of that church, it would be highly unbecoming in me, who have so much less information than they possess regarding the momentous subject, and who am not officially charged with what is their duty, to treat the subject in such a manner as to infringe upon their rights, or wound their delicacy, or manifest any want of confidence in those apostolic men.

In what I shall write, therefore, respecting the payment of the Irish Catholic Clergy, by the British crown, I disclaim any intention of interfering with the exclusive right of the Irish bishops to regulate the local discipline of their church.

As I am also beyond either their power of reward, or the operation of their displeasure, I may be permitted to give freely an opinion as to their virtues. It is right to do so on the present occasion, because it will show in what safe keeping, under divine Providence, the affairs of that church are placed.

This calumniated body of men are the immediate successors of others who have been more vilified, and occasionally persecuted. The immediate predecessor of the present venerable Bishop of Cloyne and Ross, was immured in a felon's room in the jail of the county of Cork, because, and only because he was a bishop. Another of his predecessors, who sat in the Council of Trent, was, after his return to Ross, cloven down by British light-horsemen, who accidentally met him, and were informed that he was a Popish prelate; and every intermediate bishop has endured much. The present illustrious prelate, a man of deep erudition, of solid piety, of indefatigable zeal, of most refined manners, of glowing patriotism and dignified modesty, was more than once under the necessity of following the divine monition: "when they persecute you in one city, fly to another." What have been the sufferings of those prelates upon whose remains the grave has closed within your recollection? How often were their predecessors hunted like beasts of prey, found concealed in morasses, buried in woods, hidden in caverns, covered with coarse and imperfect garments, and with difficulty obtaining the meanest fare? Those apostles left to the present occupants obedient flocks, edifying example, unsullied faith, uncontam-

inated discipline, worldly poverty, spiritual riches, the records of their afflictions, and frequently the relics of their mangled bodies. Rome is elevated by the dignity of her place; made by Peter the centre of Christian unity, she preserves and will maintain her primacy of honour and her primacy of jurisdiction. Antioch, Peter's first See, has long since fallen to decay; her patriarchal lustre gleams indistinctly in a few specks through Saracenic filth, the ruins of ancient heresies, and the dust of ages. Alexandria can no longer produce her Athanasius, to show his unbroken succession to Mark, the companion and the vicar of the prince of the Apostles, and to contend for that faith, so many of whose doctrines he had so ably testified. The protecting eagle of Ephesus screamed when the sublime mysteries, which he discerned and exhibited, were obscured in his own great city by the followers of Macedonius, of Nestorius, of Eutyches, and of Arius: but, when the crescent glittered on the unholy rites of Arabian imposture, he took his melancholy departure. The successor of James was wanting in Jerusalem; Britain has long bewailed the defection of her hierarchy. Cruel, deceitful, hypocritical infidelity, for a time tore the garland of her glory from France. Memphis, after ages of darkness, relumed her torch at Rome, and set up a beacon for the Copts to collect at the altars of their fathers. Nor Turk, nor infidel, has done so much to destroy those churches, as was done to extinguish your Irish hierarchy: yet still it has uninterruptedly continued, and modestly beams forth its pure rays to cheer a people who have endured more than any other. They were stripped of the inheritance of their fathers; they were robbed of their fair fame; they were frequently almost exterminated. History was destroyed, evidence of facts was suppressed, calumnious fictions were published to defame the immolated: the survivors were goaded into resistance, and punished as criminals for resisting; they still were attached to the faith of Christ. It was impossible to educate their children at home: they were sent abroad for education; it was made criminal for them to return: should one of them become a clergyman, and be found in the land of his people, it was death; yet they became clergymen, they returned, they were seized upon, they were executed, often after a summary trial before a brutal foe; and the world was told that the punishment was inflicted not for religion, but for crime, when religion and crime were synonymous. Thus were they defamed to the world. When Nero condemned the Christian to the stake, or to the lions, the martyr was not defamed; he stood before the world in his character of sufferer for the sake of conscience. The pagan might lament his supposed folly, but he must admire his steadiness of principle; but it would be depriving

him of the sympathy of the mistaken, but well disposed, if it had been published that he did not suffer for his religion, but for a crime against the state: and Nero's worst act was, after he set fire to Rome, to put the Christians to death for the conflagration; so, when a dominant soldiery were sent to make a people act against their conviction, the refusal of this people was called crime, and they were put to death as criminals, because they would not become perjured hypocrites, and swear that they believed what they did not, or abandon a religion in which they believed God commanded them to serve him. But this was not all; Parsons and Borlase did worse than ever Nero did, when, in 1641, they contrived the massacre of Catholics, that they might get their property; and when the deed of blood could not be concealed, they boldly and impudently charged the Catholics with the massacre of a greater number of Protestants than were to be found in the district, and miraculously caused that there should be nearly as many survivors after the massacre of the whole, as there originally existed.

Thus by every species of persecution and defamation, by the sword, and by the gibbet, by famine, by oppression, by plunder, by exile, by calumny, by the suppression of truth, by the publication of falsehood, did the British government, during two centuries, in vain endeavour the destruction of the Irish hierarchy. Still it survives in its apostolic glory, a band of learned, pious, disinterested, intrepid, defamed prelates, supported by a host of enlightened, religious, obedient, active, zealous, and charitable clergy, poor in worldy pelf, rich in the glories of the Gospel and the affections of the people.

The people of Ireland retained the Roman Catholic religion. When King Henry VIII. changed the religion of England, he was not able to effect a similar change in Ireland. In the time of Edward VI. it was scarcely known that any of the Irish followed the English religious changes. Mary's reign was noted in Ireland for some political afflictions and forfeitures, but no religious feud. But under Elizabeth, the extermination of the Catholics, the colonization by Protestants, the fines, the forfeitures, and the inflictions commenced. The Protestant clergy were sent from England, to read the common prayer in English, or in Latin, to a people whose language was Irish, and whose religion was Catholic. Those men, with scarcely the semblance of flocks, were put into possession of the churches and the revenues, and the people, who concealed their own clergy, were obliged to support them by their own contributions. During this and the subsequent reigns of James and Charles, whole regions of the country were depopulated of Catholics and were given to Presbyterians from Scotland, who were known

as Scotch Irish. Cromwell rushed like a gaunt dog to swallow what prey was left, and placed his needy enthusiasts thickly in the richest places of the island. William's Dutchmen were next provided for, and every needy foreign Protestant, by entering a corporate town or city, paying a shilling to its town clerk, and taking an oath of allegiance to the king and of execration of Catholic doctrines, was clothed with civic honours to which a native Catholic never could aspire. Swarms of those men flocked in from every place in which a Protestant was ever found, and were invested with wealth and power, whilst the native Catholics, forced by misery and oppression from their native land, became the hewers of wood and the drawers of water to every civilized nation of the globe. The clergy were made the sport, and the victims of the dregs of the Protestant population. The Sunday amusement of some of the inhabitants of my former parish was, about sixty years since, to scour the country, "priest hunting," and wo be to the priest who was caught! The very name of priest was a term of reproach; I have been myself, since I was admitted to orders, as well as many of my brethren, insulted repeatedly from the circumstance of our being clergymen, and this by persons who moved in the several classes of society, from the Protestant culprit who had been sentenced to be hanged, but was not, to the judge who passed the sentence: from the Orange freeman, the price of whose vote was his chief means of support, to the proud peer whose vote spurned our petition for the common rights of subjects; from the miserable sexton to the supercilious incumbent of a bishopric. I have heard one, who swelled from the diminutive size of an almost expiring foundling, to the full bulk of aldermanic ponderosity, utter, in a dialect like English, his contempt for certain Romish priests, and those Romish priests were venerable bishops, decorated with the well-earned honours of the best universities of Europe, and as estimable for their virtues as they were humble in their demeanour. But to insult the Catholic priesthood was not only the privilege of the Irish Protestant, the exercise of this privilege was, by many, thought to be the proof of liberality.

You will ask me, why all this amplification? Why remind us of the bad feeling of past time? Certainly, not to exasperate. I can fully answer to my conscience—not for any uncharitable purpose. But for the purpose of understanding fully the subject of which I am about to treat; and to warn you of danger: I shall now apply it to that purpose. I assert, that amongst the principal part of the Protestant population which at present opposes your restoration to your rights, those unbecoming feelings still exist. They are, at the present day, the feelings of

the Orangeman; they are the feelings of the grand juries of several counties; they are the feelings of a large portion of the British legislature. I shall prove those propositions by plain evidence before I close these letters.

I then ask, what can be the object of men who feel thus towards the Catholic clergy in consenting to have them pensioned by government, in place of being supported by the people? Can they have any object beneficial or honourable to that clergy? But they do not leave us any room for conjecture; they give us positive evidence: they say, that the object is to make the clergy more loyal, by making them dependent upon the crown for their income. When they avow this to be their object, will you say it is not? When history proves this must be their object, will you reject the analogy upon which the proof is founded, when they refer to that very analogy?

What was the testimony of the Honourable Denis Browne, one of the members for the county of Mayo, before the committee of the House of Lords? That Catholic emancipation would be of no use for the tranquility of Ireland, unless the clergy were pensioned. That the clergy now made the people disaffected, but if the clergy were to be paid by the crown and not by the people, the clergy would be the most enthusiastic loyalists. He instanced the case of the Presbyterians. Before their clergy in Ireland were paid by the crown he said they were the most factious and seditious men in Ireland: and they made their flocks turbulent and disaffected. The crown paid them, and they were loyal, and their flocks were more attached to government. Such was his opinion of the pensioning system. The object which he had in view was, through the cupidity of the priesthood, to insure the loyalty of the people. What does old Denis Browne mean by loyalty? Such an attachment to the executive parts of your government as exists amongst the established clergy, and is making rapid progress amongst the Presbyterians. An attachment perfectly incompatible with civil liberty. My friend, we have in this country, civil and religious liberty in their full perfection. It is true that the constitutions of North Carolina and New Jersey are essentially illiberal, and that the misrepresentations of British writers have here created great prejudices against Roman Catholics. But if those constitutions were to be revised, there is no question but the bigotry which disgraces them would be swept away: and honest and assiduous investigation for truth is correcting those serious misrepresentations: the people of America cannot be asked for their assent, without exhibiting to them a sufficient ground for the claim.

I stated that we had here the perfection of civil and religious lib-

erty; there is not a doubt upon my mind, but that if the clergy of these states were to be pensioned by the general government, instead of being maintained by the people, our constitution would rapidly decay; and one of the wisest provisions which this confederation ever made, is to be found in the first amendment to its constitution, declaring that Congress has no power to establish any religion. What is meant by loyalty amongst your very loyal people of Ireland, is not that which your constitution means by the expression. One of your very loyal men in Ireland, would call a man who complained of the interference of the ministers of the crown with the election of the members of the House of Commons, a rebel who was grossly disloyal. He would plead before those same ministers as the proof of his own loyalty, that he inquired what candidate the oligarchy preferred, and that by right and by wrong, he exerted himself to have this man returned. This loyalist is disloyal to your constitution, but he is faithful to the executive. The meaning of loyalty in Ireland is a ready subserviency to the king's minister. Mr. Browne then states that pensioning the clergy would make them subservient to the executive, or to the king's ministers, or in other words, to the oligarchy by which you are ruled. Have you any doubt but that this would be the effect of the pensioning? Was not this effect produced amongst the Presbyterians? Is not the clergy of the establishment enslaved by this very principle; though, as I will show you, their state is really more independent than that of your clergy would be? How often have I heard you use this argument, and vary its exemplification through every trope and comparison which you could find? How often have I heard you tell our assembled thousands, that if the bishops so far overlooked their religious obligation as to accept of pensions for themselves and for the priesthood; you would, as a friend to the liberties of your country, protest against placing so formidable a force in the hands of the minister of the crown to direct against the proper independence of the people? If you have forgotten this, I have not; and Ireland remembers it.

I take two views of this pensioning system: I see it not only concurred in, but actually brought forward by the most insidious enemies of the Irish Catholic church. I suspect, and not without a cause, the gifts of my avowed enemies. Whence arises this kindness of the illiberal portion of your pretended friends? Is it love for you incites them? My friend, they have urged the north wind to blow its violent hurricane upon you; you did abide its fury, but you wrapped your cloak about you, and rolled in your religious mantle, you more tenaciously preserved what it was sought to take away. The rage of the tempest has

passed; a few clouds still remain; occasional gusts make you cautious; but if they shall subside, and the sunbeams cheer you, this cloak will be no longer necessary; you will cast it aside, and when it shall have been removed, how are you to protect yourself if the same spirit of the winds, whose power will still continue, should again sweep your country? Your clergy will have been severed from your people. Suppose the peasantry oppressed, and the clergyman threatened with the loss of his wages, if he will stand by them, where is your remedy? This is no metaphysical supposition. In my next I shall give ample proof; at present I ask you, is it not to prevent the clergyman from telling the people of their wrongs that it is sought to make him a pensioner of the crown? The wolves ask your dogs, and you will give them up; what have the wolves offered in return? To allow a few of your bellwethers the use of a clover pasture? Have the wolves permitted you to extract their teeth or to bind their jaws? I must conclude this in haste, and resume the topic in my next.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IX

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 10, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My Dear Friend:—I now assert that it is a principle of the British executive to crush, if it can, in its dominions, any power, however small, which might exist independent of itself: but if it cannot crush it, its efforts will be directed to make this power become dependent upon it, and if it be in any way dependent, its exertions will still be directed to increase that dependence. Thus, during a long series of years, it has been making gradual inroads upon the civil rights of the people. The church was a spiritual power not dependent upon the crown, in the Saxon times. William of Normandy, at the time of the conquest, made a change in ecclesiastical property similar to that which he made in civil titles, and as in the latter he substituted fiefs and infeudations for allodial tenure, so in the church he substituted benefices for *frankalmoigne*. William Rufus went still farther; but his attempts were cut short, perhaps unintentionally, by the arrow of Tyrrell. Very few of the Plantagenet dynasty abstained from similar attempts. The aggressions of Henry II., notwithstanding constitutional and canonical impediments, caused, at first, the vacillation and subsequently the martyrdom of Thomas a Becket. The aggression of the

crown and the resistance of the church is a usual and ordinary historical topic, until the destruction of that church by Henry VIII., the founder of the new body which became its substitute; of which the king being head, the contention necessarily ceased. In Ireland the Catholic prelates were thrust out of their possessions, and the men who were substituted for them, being dependent upon the executive, were by it upheld and cherished. The efforts of the crown were then directed, as we have before seen, to the extermination of the old hierarchy, which now subsisted independent of any power but God and the people.

After those means, which I have alluded to in my last letter, had been found unavailing, when the very executioner turned away in fatigue and disgust from the prolonged and useless havoc, a mitigated persecution tortured the spirit, plundered the property, but generally spared the life and limbs of the Catholic. His church was humble but it was independent. Like the Apostles and their early successors, the good prelates of the Irish church felt and knew that their kingdom was not of this world. They derived no power from the crown, they claimed no temporal authority, they challenged no civil obedience; they told their flocks to render unto God the things that were God's, and to render unto Cæsar the things that were Cæsar's. They merely superintended the religious concerns of their faithful people, and in return the people gave them affection and support.

There was also a large body of Presbyterians in Ireland, whose clergy were independent of the crown, being supported by the voluntary contributions of their flocks. At this period that clergy and their flocks felt and acted freely and constitutionally for the benefit of Ireland, and Ireland, after ages of misrule and of oppression, began to vindicate her rights and to obtain a constitution; the crown, in its bounty, bestowed a gift upon the Presbyterian clergy: they became dependent upon the crown; and the supporters of the encroachments of prerogative have no longer the same dread of that body that their predecessors had.

The crown observed that the Catholics were increasing in numbers, and in power, and in wealth, and that their clergy, which had so long been the object of the most bitter hatred, and most barbarous persecution, still retained its independence: accordingly, Lord Castlereagh, and others, gave a miserable dole out of the public purse, to establish a college for the education of candidates for orders in Ireland, that they should not imbibe the principles of other governments in continental seminaries, and to create amongst them an attachment to their native land and to its constitution. I look upon this policy to be correct and

praiseworthy, except that the sum was a trifle, and the government was really hostile to those whom it was obliged to treat with comparative mildness. The Catholics were grateful for even this boon, and their gratitude would have been excessive had full justice been done. But no! they were not to receive any more kindness. We have seen how the good results which would have followed the concession of 1793, were prevented by the contrivers of the union. They now saw how the Presbyterian independence was laid prostrate by the means of paying the clergy.

In a moment of good feeling, when hopes, which have never been realized, were held out by the contrivers of Ireland's degradation to the episcopal trustees of the college, in order to procure their aid to make the legislative union popular, those prelates were asked, upon the part of government, whether, in case of the crown granting a provision for the support of the Catholic clergy, it could be assured of their loyalty, and whether this support would be acceptable. You know that those good and unsuspecting men did much mischief to your cause, by their hasty answer, "That this support would be acceptable, and that in case of its being granted, the government could be assured of the loyalty of its pensioners." Unfortunate answer! How much dissension has it caused? How many tears has it cost those who gave it? But the measure of union was carried, and it was hoped by the crown that the Catholics, now a minority in a united empire, would become comparatively insignificant. Their clergy were thought not to be even worth the pittance which would have been doled out under other circumstances to insure your loyalty! But in 1808, when the question of emancipation began to press, and it was found by the Ponsonby party that the objection of the disloyalty of the priesthood was conjured up as a barrier to your claims, then the people of Ireland learned, for the first time, with grief and consternation, the appalling fact that traffic with the clergy had been in contemplation. The bishops met. The question was examined, not only by the ten who had been imposed upon, but by the whole hierarchy, and the interference of the crown with the independence of the clergy, and the system of pensions, were both declared to be incompatible with the safety of religion. The aggregate meetings proclaimed their incompatibility with civil liberty, and no person, my friend, was more enthusiastically vociferous in the condemnation of pensions than was Daniel O'Connell.

It was then that the moderate men, the natural leaders, began, in the county of Louth, to put their insidious questions to the venerable Primate Reilly; it was then those divisions began which made our

enemies rejoice and caused us to weep. I say us, for I was then amongst you; then you and I stood upon the same ground, and whether it was a vague document from Cardinal Litta, or a mandate from Monsignor Quarantotti, or a holiday speech from some sprig of nobility, or a frown from some government contractor, or a prudent advice from some hollow-hearted false friend, or a blasphemous imprecation from a boisterous and brutal squire, or an *ex officio* information from Mr. Saurin, made to us little matter. The clergy and the people withstood the friends of the crown and the natural leaders. It was in the process of this confusion that your friend, Mr. Canning, brought in his clauses appended to the bill, that Sir John Cox Hippesley ransacked Europe for restrictions. It was during those combats that Counsellor Bellew earned his third pension. But we saved our principle, and we called it a victory that the bishops were saved from the veto, and the clergy were saved from the pensions.

I do not know what you think now, but I know what you thought then: at that time you looked upon the pensions to be worse than the veto. It was after this the Divan people prevailed upon you to attend a few close meetings of the moderate party, who could see no harm in either veto or pensions to priests or to barristers. You came back, however, and you joined with us who had remained still unchanged in our opinion. But now, if I understand the papers, you have altered your opinion, and you think pensions ought to be given to the clergy. Is this so?—And you told the people to say nothing about a commission of bishops and its feathers, which is called *a wing,* and of which wing all that I shall say is that it looks so very like the veto that I would not know which to prefer, except that I am inclined to think the more intelligibly mischief is done, the better.

There is another reason why I shall write nothing upon the subject of this wing. A Rev. Mr. Sheehan, who is, I understand, a respectable priest in Waterford, commanded a Mr. Kirby, who was making a speech at an aggregate meeting in that city, in last July, to say nothing about this wing, because Dr. Murray and Dr. Doyle thought it good. This circumstance is sufficient to teach an American bishop silence. There was a time when, notwithstanding the opinions of prelates for whom I entertain such profound respect, I would have written what now I should not write. I must adopt a language respecting this commission and its feathers, which indeed will appear as strange from me as the advocacy of the pension system does from you: it is the language of the Cork protestors of 1813, whom now I find in their first places in that city, and with their old phrases: "Without giving any

opinion upon the clauses added to the bill in the last session." I shall then give no opinion upon the right wing. But I ask you concerning the left wing, is it true that you are now friendly to the system of pensioning the clergy? Is not the principle of the British crown that which I have laid down at the commencement of this letter? Has it not been evinced in every stage since the battle of Hastings? Has it not been manifested for centuries in Ireland? Are not the Presbyterian clergy a recent instance? Do you want proof beyond the attempts made upon your own clergy in the bargaining about the union? In the attempts by Mr. Canning's clauses; by Mr. Plunkett's dictation; by Sir Francis Burdett's wings; by Mr. Bellew's pensions; by suppressing or prosecuting every society that opposed traffic on the clergy; and by cherishing everybody who supported it? Neither are you ignorant of the indirect attempts made in Rome, upon the independence of your hierarchy, to which city the king of England cannot send even an answer to a polite letter, but to which the king of Hanover sends an ambassador; and you know the acts of that excellent personage, whether they regarded the queen of England or the Catholics of Ireland. The object is then to increase the influence of the crown and to control the independence of the clergy by making them dependent upon the executive. Will you concur in this? You may; but if you do, I have lost all knowledge of the state of Ireland, or I know nothing of the mode of preserving civil liberty, or you are no friend to Irish liberty. It afflicts me to write thus—you will give me great comfort by correcting, if there is any mistake in my fact or in my argument.

To the venerable prelates of Ireland I shall not presume to address myself, because I write only as a Roman Catholic who loves the little remnant of civil liberty which still exists in the land upon which his eye first opened, but upon which that eye is never likely to look again. I interfere not with the discipline of the Irish Church. But surely neither they nor you can have forgotten the manner in which that part of the jail act regarding Catholic chaplains has been so very frequently executed. I shall, however, give an outline for my American readers.

In 1810, an act was passed by the British Parliament, amongst other things, authorizing grand juries in the several counties in Ireland, to levy money upon their counties for the remuneration of certain officers of prisons. This act required them to appoint for every prison an inspector, who was to have a salary according to their opinion of justice, more or less. The act made it imperative upon the jury to appoint the resident Protestant clergyman of the established church to this office, if he would accept it. Next it required of them to appoint a Protestant

chaplain of the established church for the prison, whether there were any prisoners of his religion or not, and made it imperative upon them to appoint a clergyman of the established church in holy orders, who should be a fit and proper person for the office. Next, it desired that, when it should be necessary, they should appoint a dissenting minister, who should be a fit and proper person for the office, to be the Protestant dissenting chaplain, and in like manner when it would be deemed necessary, a Roman Catholic priest to be Roman Catholic chaplain: the chaplains were to have not only spiritual duties to perform, but were weekly in rotation to see the food of the prisoners distributed, and do other duties.

This bill appeared to be most liberal in its provision, for it regulated a maximum and a minimum salary for the chaplains, and the chaplains of the same prison to have the same salary. The Protestant clergyman had very little to do in most of the prisons, and he was generally chaplain and inspector, and as inspector he had to superintend himself, distributing provisions in his rotation as chaplain; all this we, however, considered liberal, and the act was universally considered fair and impartial in its provisions.

I attended a large jail without any salary during two years, before this bill was enacted, and I was under the act afterwards nominated to be entitled to the salary. The presentment for salary was made. I observed before the jury came into court, that I had only the very lowest salary awarded to me, and of course my colleague of the established church had but the same. He had been, under an old act, inspector, and had a fixed salary. He had now less trouble as inspector, but his salary as inspector was very considerably increased. I presented a memorial to Baron Smith, who presided; he asked the jury whether my duties did not deserve more than the highest salary; they said it was plain that the highest was too small a remuneration for my services. Why, then, said he, have you given him only the lowest? Their answer was, because if they gave the Catholic chaplain a high salary, they should give the same to the Protestant chaplain for whose services the lowest was too great. But, said the judge, can you not curtail from the increase of the Protestant chaplain's salary as inspector, the excess which you will give to him as chaplain, in order legally to be able to do even imperfect justice to his Catholic colleague? They could not understand this: and the small salary was given to the chaplains, and the high salary to the inspector. The judge saw that many of my extra duties were of such a nature as gave me a claim upon the consolidated fund out of which the expenses regarding convicts were paid, and he told me that

the lord lieutenant had it legally in his power to pay me from this fund; at the desire of Baron Smith, I gave him a memorial, which he presented and the prayer of which he supported, and in answer I received, under the official seal, the thanks of the Duke of Richmond, then lord lieutenant, for my zealous discharge of duty, with a statement that I was to get no other remuneration. I have selected my own case, not because it was singular nor one of great hardship, but because I wish to show that all my conclusions are drawn from premises which are unquestionable. Have half the remunerations under the jail act been impartially and fairly made? Does the grand jury ever ask how a clergyman votes or feels towards the members of the county? Is there in the Irish government, or in the Irish grand juries, a disposition to treat Catholic clergymen fairly and impartially?

I now come to a case which you ought to know well. When the Rev. B. Murphy resigned the chaplaincy of Newgate, in the city of Dublin, who was appointed? An excommunicated priest. When the prisoners complained of being deprived of the aid of religion, there was no redress—a complaint was brought into court, old Julge Downes would not, and legally could not listen to you, when you offered to prove that the man was not fit or proper to be chaplain. The act had been drawn so as studiously to omit the words fit and proper before the description of the person to be Catholic chaplain, and to insert them before the Protestant, but even if they were inserted in the case of the Catholic, Judge Downes, if I recollect well, told you that the grand jury and not the archbishop were to be the judges of his qualifications. This man withdrew; they found another interdicted priest; they appointed him; he refused; they appointed a crazy priest,—he too had sense enough to refuse; the bad priests were exhausted; no more mad priests could be found; they appointed a good clergyman, but he had a parish at about one hundred miles distance. Has Newgate got a chaplain as yet? How many facts of this sort have occurred within the last twelve years?

I shall to-day write no more upon the subject; my heart has been sickened. I have just now, as I was about to follow up my topics, seen enough. Your speech at Bridge Street Chapel has been just put into my hands. You and I have ceased to think alike. The visions of my hope have been dissipated. I cannot write now. I shall address you one or two more letters, which will probably be all that you shall be troubled with by your sincere friend,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER X

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 17, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My dear Friend:—We will now review what I have so tediously dwelt upon in my preceding letters. I endeavoured to show that the proposed changes in the qualifications of freeholders would injure the remnant of civil liberty which Ireland has, and would be a serious evil to the Roman Catholics of that country.

At a meeting of the Roman Catholics of St. Andeon's Parish, in Dublin, on the 9th of July last, some of the members expressed their dissatisfaction at your conduct in respect to silencing the Catholics, by requesting them to say nothing of the wing. You got a vote of thanks for your distinguished services. No person objected to it upon general grounds. I sincerely believe that no man better deserves it for purity of intention, and for untiring exertion, and for many and valuable services: but you will forgive me if I adhere to the old principles, our agreement in which gave me the honour of your acquaintance, and upon those principles I must now differ from you. In answer to that vote, you made a speech, and in that speech you are reported by the papers to have said:

"With regard to the measure affecting the freeholders, I am sensible that that has been injurious, and has retarded our progress. I know that it has been rather a dead weight to impede us, than a wing to help us on; and no man is more ready to condemn its effect, or to deplore its introduction, than I am, and accordingly my friend, Mr. M'Laughlin, has, at this moment, in his pocket, a portion of the report of the Committee of Twenty-one, condemnatory of the introduction of that measure, because it has retarded our cause. I am conscious that it has done us a disservice, and therefore, I shall be the first to oppose its reintroduction, if it should be attempted at any future time."

This passage gave me some consolation, but it was soon diminished by the answer which you are reported to have made, to that honest and unchanging and respectable man Nicholas Mahon.

"Mr. Mahon congratulated the meeting on its having made a convert of Mr. O'Connell, and elicited an avowal of his disapprobation of measures so injurious.—(Cries of No, no.) He was justified in what he said, for Mr. O'Connell had condemned the Disfranchisement Bill.

"Mr. O'Connell disclaimed this. The measure regarding the forty shilling freeholders was not, in his opinion, a disfranchisement, but an enfranchisement, inasmuch as it would add to the influence of the freeholders, by augmenting their numbers—but he regretted its introduction as connected with the Catholic Relief Bill, as it had operated to retard the success of the latter."

On the subsequent Tuesday, the 12th of July, you attended at a

meeting of Catholic gentlemen at the Corn Exchange Rooms, Lord Killeen in the chair, and you are reported to have said:

"As to union, I really thought that the causes for any breach of it were long gone by. The only measures that could be laid hold on, as a ground or pretext for disunion, were measures which did not originate with the Catholics at all, but emanated from persons purporting to be their friends; and these measures were considered to be calculated to serve our cause. I am now convinced that, so far from benefitting, they have injured us; and that it is our business hereafter to seek our emancipation distinct from and unconnected with those measures. While I avow this, my lord, let no man misunderstand me. I am for my own part dissatisfied with the system of the elective franchise in Ireland. I would be glad to see some measure introduced that would put an end to the power which the aristocracy have of creating perjury and fictitious votes. Some deliberate measure on the subject of the elective franchise would be salutary and useful, but such measure ought not to form any part of the Catholic question. There is no doubt that it was well intended by those who introduced the measure. I thought at the time that they were mistaken in the idea that the introduction of the measure would be serviceable to our cause, and am now convinced that if these measures should at any time be proposed to be revived in connexion with the Catholic question, it will be our business to unite our efforts to dissuade our friends from their introduction. These, my lord, are my sentiments with regard to the forty shilling freeholders."

For one result I am now anxious that the mock friends of the Catholics are not again likely to obtain the aid of that body to weaken their own power under the pretext of not encouraging perjury. It would be easy to suggest a variety of modes to diminish perjury and fraud at elections; no method will destroy them. I assure you that what we used to mean by "unconditional emancipation" is the best remedy. It neither suits my present feelings nor would it be of any use to enter upon the proof. I make the assertion, that what you have, bad as it is, and it is bad enough, is much better for public liberty than any unconstitutional alterations which would be made; the spirit of your government is, by every alteration to increase the power of the crown, to diminish the rights of the people—amongst other changes within my own recollection was one to gag us at elections, whereas we had formerly the liberty of speech. I say we, because I was then a freeholder, and the present Sergeant Goold decided that I could not speak, though I would be allowed to vote. If you love Ireland, do not meddle with this freehold regulation, because the sort of Parliament you have will, in case of any alteration, make it worse.

I never suspected you to have had any share in originating the contemplated destruction of the rights of your best friends—no, I always knew the plot originated with your worst friends. Before I left Ireland, I believe in 1820, it was, I knew it was, determined on, for I was told so; but they were aware that it would be too barefaced an aggres-

sion except by way of barter; I was told they would wait for a favourable opportunity, and I was grieved to find they had ingenuity enough to make you appear even for a time to be their accomplice. I do not feel that I could with propriety publish my authority; but I declare to you that in or before the year 1820, I knew as well that such a measure was intended by the party who have been during years using the Catholic body, as I now know that they have attempted it.

The proposed change would, there can be no question, throw the Irish Catholic interest back to an incalculable distance. Emancipation therefore with this would be no boon.

You acknowledge joining it with your question did an injury—and that such an attempt would be in future opposed. It would comfort me if I could hope that such a good resolution would be adhered to. You never would originate such a scheme of ruin, neither would many of the honourable and patriotic men who voted for it, if they had not been deceived. What shall I say of you? Your act has been public, the stake is immense, the liberties of Ireland, the safety of religion. Private attachment must neither tempt to flatter, or to conceal. I believe your good nature was wrought upon by your kind friends. You were looked upon as the man who, as Mr. Sheil told the lords, could make the Catholics of Ireland do as you would, and therefore, all their cunning, all their eloquence, all their kindness, all their flattery was brought to bear upon you; and they prevailed upon you to write to the people to be quiet, and you thought that you would be answerable for all the consequences of disappointment of emancipation if you did not write.

You did much good in England, but I do believe you did more evil; you went into temptation; you will be Daniel O'Connell when with the people; you will not when you get into other places; your explanations confirm the truth of the conjectures which I formed when I read your letters. I would hazard a conjecture that several of your fellow-deputies, who are now protected by your bulk, were much more active in aiding your bad friends to procure your assent, than they are now in defending you, or in honestly avowing their equal accountability. I have now done with this topic.

Many times within the last two months have I regretted my having entered upon this discussion, for to me it is most unpleasant to pursue it. And now the most affecting part remains, your acquiescence in the pensioning system. And you throw the responsibility upon Doctor Murray and Doctor Doyle!!!

What have I exhibited in my former letters on the subject of pen-

sioning the clergy? Have I not shown that the object evidently was to use the clergy for political purposes, and this use was to be made of them by the executive power of Britain? Such has always been the object of every government in taking the church under its protection. There might be found a few instances which are exceptions to this general position. But they are indeed very rare: I could exhibit in the history of every European government during the last ten centuries, what I glanced at regarding Britain. Sometimes peculiar circumstances placed the church in such a way as that she had only a choice of evils, and she chose what she believed the lesser.

Thus the Church of Rome was obliged at one time to form a union with the Emperor of the Romans; the alliance was originally useful, but ultimately mischievous, yet perhaps it was a lesser evil than would be the ravages, the depredations, the tyranny of the Italian princes, and the Italian republics. Were there brave and good men who could protect the church from the intrigues of the holy Roman Empire, and of the licentious states and potentates which rose from the ruins of Augustulus, we would probably not have our history stained with the dark blots of papal immorality and ecclesiastical simony, which form stumbling blocks for the ignorant and landmarks for the reflecting.

Were the feudal system of benefices never introduced into the church, she would have been poorer, she might have been oppressed, but undoubtedly the novel-writer who now misleads the public judgment would not have found in history prototypes for some of his debased churchmen; he would not then have had the semblance of excuse for his insinuation that the body was like its worst members.

Without then arraigning the acts of former rulers of the church, one conclusion is evident: there never was a union of church and state which did not bring serious evils to religion; I shall not now examine whether those evils were counterbalanced by equal benefits. But I do know that the Founder of our faith did not unite the church and state; and I do know that in England and in Germany in modern times, as well as in Greece formerly, the worst persecutions which the church had to endure and the greatest power of inflicting injury upon religion uniformly arose from this union. Without writing harshly of thousands of good and better men who differ from me in opinion, I am convinced that a total separation from the temporal government, is the most natural and safest state for the church in any place where it is not, as in the papal territory, a complete goverment of churchmen.

Doctor Murray has told me, and his grace will probably recollect that it was a portion of our last conversation when, previous to my

departure, I had the pleasure of speaking with him at his own house, that he agreed with me in opinion, that the manner in which the Irish Church was circumstanced, as to its independence of any government or lay body which could control it, was the best in Christendom. The archbishop's opportunities of observation were far more extensive than mine are ever likely to be—certainly more extensive than mine have been. He stated what you must admit, that the efficient manner in which the duties of religion were discharged by a most meritorious priesthood, placed the Irish Catholic Church in the first rank in the universe. Other churches might equal, but none surpassed it. What little opportunity I have since had of observing, and it was not trifling, the operation of the principle of a church under the control of a lay power, leaves no doubt whatever upon my mind, but that it is, and must inevitably be, most injurious to religion. I could pile facts upon facts from the history of the church in former and recent times which would make this the most evident proposition you ever read or thought upon. It would indeed then be to me a subject of astonishment were I to learn that my respected adviser, the Archbishop of Dublin, was not most reluctant to permit in his own church what he thought it would not be well to permit in mine.

With the zealous, learned, and intrepid Doctor Doyle, I had indeed little conversation upon the topic; I believe it is twelve years since even this little passed between us; and if I am not greatly in error, the answer of the Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin before the committee of the lords expressed sentiments similar to those then expressed by me—and never changed. And at that time Daniel O'Connell and I spoke the same language. To me then it was not strange to learn that Doctor Doyle would be most reluctant to permit what would be injurious to religion.

The whole body of the Irish bishops declared that giving to the British government any right to interfere directly or indirectly in the nomination of your clergy must essentially injure, and might eventually destroy the Catholic religion in Ireland. Mr. Peel gives you the principle of the British government, in his answer to the application of the Belfast Institution for aid: "You refuse to allow the crown any right to interfere with the appointment of your officers, we cannot aid you, because it is a uniform principle of government not to give pecuniary aid except where it has a control over the institution." If I have not given the words exactly, I have no doubt but that I have given their exact import.

If then it is a principle of government to look for a *quid pro quo,*

and what government does not, can the inference be more plain? And is it to Daniel O'Connell I must write thus? O, that I could but recollect some of the volumes of arguments which he used to roll out in endless variety upon the topic!!

I was indeed somewhat startled at reading the following passage in your speech on the 9th of July, at Bridge Street Chapel:

"I saw that there was a prospect of achieving the liberty of Ireland, by means at which, under other circumstances, and if acting only upon my own judgment, I should have shuddered with horror. But I did not rest on my own authority—I was in communion with two prelates who are the ornaments of Ireland—Dr. Doyle, and Dr. Murray. Can I offer a better plea than when I say that I did nothing, said nothing, that had not their entire concurrence and sanction. Is there in the universal Catholic Church, a prelate on whose purity the Catholics of Ireland could rest with more unqualified confidence than Dr. Murray's? I shall content myself with saying, that no act was done, nor any words spoken by me, that had not the stamp of their aprpobation."

I immediately concluded that those two respectable prelates had approved of the wings, and had approved of your telling the people to be quiet. I also recollected the priest at Waterford commanding Mr. Kirby not to condemn what the prelates had approved of. Such was the expression of the newspaper. You also said at Bridge Street:

"This I am resolved upon, and I have also determined to persevere in the line of conduct I have already adopted, namely, to do nothing that shall not be recommended to me by the sanction of the clergy, the watchful guardians of our faith. On them we may rely with confidence for the preservation of the purity of our sacred religion."

Indeed I was melancholy when I read those passages. I took up my pen and wrote the last paragraph of my last letter. Another paper arrived, and I read your speech at the meeting at the Corn Exchange. Speaking of the pensioning system you say:

"It is well known that it was with reluctance that the Roman Catholic bishops consented to this proposition. The only condition on which they would countenance it, was the complete emancipation of their countrymen, and even on these terms, they by no means wished for the measure. As to the deputation, they were merely acquiescent."

This relieved me, for I discovered that you had not the approbation of the prelates for the pensions. A reluctant acquiescence is not approbation. If they were reluctant, it must have been from a conviction that the measure was not a good one for religion. Was it good for the civil liberty of Ireland?

There was a time when Daniel O'Connell used to say that uniting church and state was making too strong a combination against the people, and was dangerous to civil liberty: and upon this principle, that though the bishops should not find it injurious to religion to make

themselves and their clergy dependent upon the crown, he would as a subject say, that no article of Catholic faith, no general rule of church discipline, did or could exist, to prevent him and every other subject from deprecating and constitutionally opposing such an increase of executive influence. I have known some persons to argue that if the English Protestant clergy were to be paid by the King of France, let their disposition be ever so loyal, it would be, in case of war, a very dangerous temptation to which it would be wrong to expose them, as if the French monarch should, which is not very unlikely, insinuate that it would be unreasonable to expect that he should continue to support men who would preach against his cause, a few of them might be induced to be silent, when they ought to preach. Now, my friend, as I suspect you are become one of those who think this does not at all apply to the case of a mixed government, where there is a perpetual struggle between the crown and the people, would it not be folly to suppose that the best men are altogether divested of every weakness of their nature? The clergy of Ireland are not so perfect that it is meritorious to tempt them. Besides, it is not manifest folly to suppose that so excellent and perfect a government as is yours, one which is daily purchasing the right of patronage to increase its influence over the Protestant clergy, who can do little with the Irish people, should wish for a like influence over the Catholic clergy, who can do so much with the people.

It is then plain that the Irish hierarchy did declare, and upon sufficient grounds, that there ought not to be any interference on the part of government with the concerns of their church: it is plain that government has a desire to interfere in those concerns; it is plain that if they pay the clergy they will have a pretext which they have not at present, for that interference; and it is natural that the Irish prelates should be very reluctant to afford that pretext, and it is a fact that they are reluctant. Doctor Doyle swore that so far as he was concerned, it was a fact, and Daniel O'Connell testifies it for Doctor Murray and Doctor Doyle. All this is consistent. But it lies with you to reconcile this to your statement, that you have the stamp of their approbation for what you testify they are reluctant to admit; for a measure which they by no means wish for; a measure at which, acting only upon your own judgment, you would have shuddered with horror. Upon whose judgment was the horror destroyed? Was it upon the judgment of bishops, who by no means wished for what would horrify you? My friends, it will be a new chemical theory of feeling to establish that the addition of dislike and deprecation to shuddering of

horror will result in perfect approbation! Thus it is plain the bishops disliked it, you shuddered at it, and the deputation were merely acquiescent to the measure. Where did it originate? You tell us "With persons purporting to be your friends." And was this new to you? Did not this very arrangement always "emanate from persons purporting to be your friends?" The nature of the arrangement is not altered by the source of its origin, but must be looked for in its essence. Our old custom was to disregard sources, but to examine principles and facts. I assert that your friends of other religions are not competent to advise you upon the subject where your religion is concerned. In the first place, they all swear that you are idolaters, and it would be too great an insult to their understanding to expect they should feel interested in preserving your idolatry. But suppose they did not swear such an oath. They protest against your errors. They can feel no interest in the continuance of error; the preservation of your religion cannot be to them a matter of any moment. I write with the highest respect for them. I write from examination of myself. If I was a patriotic and conscientious British Protestant, I should wish there was not a Catholic in the empire; I would not injure any Catholic who was in the country. I would grant to him the same civil and political rights that I had, but if I felt myself conscientiously required to protest against his errors, I should feel happy at seeing him released from the dominion of those errors; I should for the sake of truth wish him to be of that religion which for its truth I adopted; and if I found that under the pretext of his holding erroneous principles of religion, he was oppressed, he would, by renouncing them, be free from the unjust oppression from which my useless vote could not release him, I therefore say, that as a patriot and a conscientious Protestant, I should wish every Catholic to believe as I did: thus would he have the double benefit of truth and freedom.

Such must be the feelings and wishes of benevolent, patriotic Protestants regarding Catholics in the British dominions. If therefore a Catholic desires to preserve his religion; highly as he is bound to respect his good Protestant friends, they are the last persons with whom he should consult as to means of its preservation; he may consult them how he can attain freedom, but not by making religious arrangements.

Mr. O'Connell says this measure originated with such men; that is no guarantee that it is not injurious to religion. I have shown from its own nature, and from the testimony of the Irish bishops, that it is injurious to our religion. Those good Protestants consider the exchange of Popery for Protestantism would be a religious and a political benefit.

But you said at the Corn Exchange:

"And here it is but justice to say, that the originators of this measure sought no interference; they sought no nomination, no veto; they left to the bishops the right of conferring and withholding dignities. Their intentions were fair and honourable; but even if they had been guilty of perfidy and of conspiracy against our religion, it now matters not, for the question is already decided."

I am far from charging or suspecting perfidy: but I differ with you; the question unfortunately is not decided, but it is the calamitous revival of a question which I had hoped was at rest, and upon whose tomb I had flattered myself you were a faithful sentinel. But your kind friends prevailed upon you to allow them to breathe into its nostrils, and lo! it stalks abroad to terrify its former opponents. You rest upon your spear and proclaim that it is innocuous! I need not say to you that natural effects will flow from natural causes, unless you can procure a miraculous, preventive intervention; and God does not frequently give his extraordinary aid to save us from the consequences of our own deliberate imprudence and negligence. Your kind friends sought no interference; certainly there was no such clause appeared in the bill, no such feather in the wing.

But they sought to give money, and this without being petitioned therefor. Whence this extraordinary generosity in those men, who, year after year refused to give four thousand pounds, nay, even one thousand seven hundred pounds addition to the income of the college for the education of that clergy? But to support that clergy they now would give a quarter of a million of pounds every year?

My friend, it would be very easy to frame a veto bill upon stating the fact in the preamble, that the crown paid, and then reciting the principle that the crown should know to whom and why. It matters little to the man who must spend the remainder of his days in prison, whether judgment be only recorded against him to-day, and the warrant be issued to-morrow, or both acts be done at the same time.

You will say that your kind friends are friends to civil liberty. It would be difficult to persuade me that the authors and supporters of the gagging bills, the approbators of the military magistrate, Parson Hay, and the homicides at Manchester, the authors of the miseries of Ireland, the component parts of the majorities which protect borough corruption, are friends to civil liberty; and a vast portion of your kind friends, especially your admired favourite, Wm. C. Plunkett, has, together with a large body of your late advisers, been upon honourable record on those lists. Probably I have acquired some strange notions of civil liberty, by my residence at this side of the Atlantic; I do not wish to lose them; but in Ireland they would fully accord with the

most perfect loyalty to the house of Hanover, if that house governed according to the British constitution, with the most perfect deference and respect to the heriditary councillors of the crown, so long as they made no encroachment upon my constitutional rights, and the most implicit reliance upon and obedience to the constitutional acts of a House of Commons, which would be fairly chosen by the people; you must then excuse me for doubting the attachment of several of your kind friends to the principles of civil liberty, as contained in the British constitution.

But there is, besides, a principle in human nature which is as much Protestant as Catholic, *solamen miseris socios habuisse doloris.* A proud, patriotic, Irish Protestant, finding that he could not make his own clergy more independent, will scarcely perceive how he is induced to make the Catholic clergy become equally dependent.

There is, too, an historical principle, if I may allow the expression, which suggests, that the clergy have always been a haughty, dominant, overbearing faction. You know it is only derived from the gross misrepresentations which are miscalled English history; but almost every Protestant, according to this principle, thinks it right to check the proud and haughty churchmen. And you know, it is almost as much a fashionable principle amongst your liberal gentry in your own church, as in any other. A thousand such little circumstances will insensibly, but powerfully lead to the conclusion: "That the clergy must be superintended." But as this is rather an offensive way of addressing domineering bishops, it is thought more prudent to say: "We mean to be kind and respectful—the people support you, and they and you are attached to each other: let them give us the money in the shape of taxes, and we will give it to you in the shape of salaries; we will compel them to pay the tax, which you cannot levy against their consent; and next year, when you will be dependent upon us, and not upon the people, we will tell you, that as we pay you, you must be our servants. All this we do most disinterestedly and for your credit, that you may not be subject to the capricious insults of a people whom you have long served, and who have long loved you; but that you may be cherished by a kind government, which endeavoured to exterminate you, but when it finds that to be a hopeless attempt, thanks to the people, is willing to make as much use of your services as it can; you must no longer be slaves to the rabble."

One more special remark, and I have done.

You said at the Corn Exchange:

"It is a cruel aspersion upon the Catholic clergy to say, that they owe their

influence to their taking money from the hard earning of the poorest people on the face of the earth. No; they owe their influence to the purity of their lives; they owe their influence to the virtue of their hearts; their owe their influence to their being the poor man's friend. It is because no miseries, no sickness, no contagion deters them from the discharge of their sacred duty, that they enjoy the respect and the veneration of the people. They are found in the distempered hut and [by] the fevered bed, and it is a proof of the justice of their influence that they have preserved it, even though they are obliged to derive their subsistence from the wretched people. If a government, purely Irish, thought that they could work the machine of the state better by contributing to the support of the Catholic clergy, leaving the hierarchy and priesthood as they stand, without violation or interference, what reasonable ground of complaint can there be?''

Here, with your leave, are two sophisms unworthy of you. No person asserted that the Irish clergy had influence with the people, because they received part of the hard earnings of that people. I am grieved to find you appear in this light. The argument was always, and you have yourself used it a thousand times, it is wrong to make the clergy dependent upon the crown, because the paymasters would be persons who have sworn that this clergy are the teachers of idolatry—because the paymasters have been, and now are most zealous for withdrawing the people from the influence of that clergy—because the paymaster seeks for interference with those who are paid, and because the prelates have decided that such interference would be dangerous, and perhaps destructive of the religious system of that clergy. It would also be wrong, because it would add to the influence of the crown, whose influence is already too great for the purity of the constitution, and because it would subject the clergy to the political tamperings of an intriguing paymaster, who is always intriguing with those whom he pays.

Your second sophism is speculating against fact, and giving the creation of your fancy, in place of what is in real existence, and likely to continue in existence. You know that you neither have, nor are likely to have a government purely Irish. One purely English, if honestly administered, would answer you as well. You know that if the government paid the clergy, it would interfere; and you acknowledge that the object of payment would be to work the machine of the state better. You said that the interference was formerly refused, because the government was hostile. You see there were several other becauses; you enumerated imperfectly. Besides, how can you say that Lord Manners, Mr. Goulburn, and the lord lieutenant, who honours the Beefsteak Club with his presence, are your ''protecting friends?'' Is Lord Eldon, is Lord Liverpool, is Mr. Peel your ''protecting friend?'' If any accident should remove your present king, would his successor be your ''protecting friend?'' Is the Duke of Clarence? I tell you, a

very large portion of the people here doubt much if your most gracious monarch is one whit a greater friend of yours than is Alderman King, to whose lasting and sincere friendship, you quaffed your social bumpers.

I have done. Where is the effect of your experience? In my next, which shall conclude this unpleasant and tedious series of letters, I shall remind you of what we did formerly under similar circumstances. I shall show you its good effects; I shall beseech you to act once more as we then did. I lament the serious mistakes which you have made. But you are, I believe, a man of incorruptible integrity, of great powers, and of well-earned influence. You can rise more gloriously than if you had never stumbled. I cherish the expectation that you will, and am, in sincerity, your friend,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XI

CHARLESTON, S. C., Sept. 23, 1825.

To Daniel O'Connell, Esq.

My dear Friend:—I know not whether my effusions have fallen under your eye, or been read by any of the people of Ireland. I have sent them directed to you, by the best mode of conveyance within my reach; but I have not taken any steps to procure their publication in Ireland. I write this in the hope that you have, or shall have read the preceding letters, before this meets your view.

In the years 1811, 1812, and 1813, a small party existed in the Catholic body, who were very anxious that the bishops should grant to the crown a right of interference with the appointment of the clergy, and should accept of pensions from the crown, and submit to a high commission for examining the loyalty of the persons chosen for the episcopacy, and testifying that there was no treason contained in dispensations from some ecclesiastical observances, or in decisions upon cases of conscience. You will forgive me if I cannot help comparing what was then contemplated to what I once knew to have occurred. When I was a student at Carlow, Doctor Moylan sent some prayer books, and "Think Well On't," to be distributed to the Catholics of the city of Cork militia, then quartered in that town. The books were seized upon and brought to a court-martial, of which that sapient and erudite theologian, Colonel Mountiford Longfield, was president, and after mature deliberation, they were honourably acquitted, upon the ground that the Popish and Protestant churches differed only respecting the divinity of the Holy Virgin. Other books which had the misfortune

of passing through my hands, were solemnly tried on board a convict ship at Cove, and were in a very dangerous predicament, because Dr. Harding told the president of the court, a very petulant, but otherwise I believe, a very good young man, who was captain of the ship, that I wrote a book which stated that an angel, upon looking into hell, saw it filled with Protestants, and upon looking into heaven, saw it filled with Catholics. I assure you, I never wrote any such book. Do not, I conjure you, believe that I did, even though the Rev. Mr. Burnett, of Cork, whoever he might be, should swear before the House of Lords that I did, as he volunteered before that Right Honourable House, an oath that I wrote a book which I did not write, but which book contains more truth, than do, perhaps, all the oaths which that reverend gentleman ever swore.

These and such others, were minor transactions, but *ex pede, Herculem;* give an anatomist even a joint of the small toe, and he will tell you the correct size of the head; give any root, however low and minute, and you can easily calculate to any power how high soever. We know what was done in dungeons and what was done in courts; we knew what were the acts of sweepers of the gateways, and also of the idol of the levee; and therefore the Catholics of Ireland, said they could not entrust what was their best gem, that pure emerald for the preservation of which, their progenitors had forfeited dominions, dignities, rules, home, blood, life, everything but soul—that which not a world could purchase; to men who themselves decried it as valueless, whose progenitors had flung it away, and committed every species of cruelty and injustice upon and against those who would not follow their example.

The Irish bishops said those regulations would essentially injure, and might eventually subvert their church. The few Catholics who differed from the body, sought to justify their conduct, by asserting that the Protestant friends of the Catholics, wished for those regulations, and thought them reasonable. I have expressed my opinion of the value of their suggestion, in my last. The party had recourse to Rome, and obtained from Monsignor Quarantotti, who held some office there, in the Pope's absence, an advice to the obstinate Catholics of Ireland, to accept the favours of the British government, *æquo gratoque animo,* that is, cheerfully and with gratitude.

The Irish bishops received this document in a manner which showed their feelings to have been greatly rubbed against. The venerable Bishop of Cloyne and Ross, was one of the first to send his answer to the vicar of the London district, through whom it was, not

unaccountably, transmitted, stating that he received it with disgust and indignation; the same expressions would indicate the feelings of nearly all the bishops. Dr. Murray at that time, in a passion sermon, made a most appropriate comparison between the crime of Judas, in betraying his divine master, and the conduct of not the agitators; and I agree with you, that "there is not in the universal Catholic church, a prelate upon whose purity the Catholics of Ireland could rest with more unqualified confidence." Yet the men who suspected that this meek archbishop alluded to them as fit associates for Judas, waited on the then Primate of Ireland, Doctor Troy, to complain of this passage. The archbishop did not name, did not even describe them; conscience was sufficiently powerful.

You were then a mighty leader of the host in which I was a soldier.—What was our resolve? What was our conduct? I shall remind you of our history.

The cases then and now, are in many respects similar. 1. The Catholics were then seeking for emancipation. 2. They had many Protestant friends in the legislature. 3. Their advocates in and out of Parliament, were divided in opinion respecting concessions. One part said that the Catholics ought, upon their being restored to their rights, give to the crown some equivalent; they used to call this barter making concessions to their Protestant brethren, in return for the favour bestowed upon themselves. Then and now some Catholics joined with this portion of their friends. A second part said, that the spirit of the constitution and common justice, required the Catholics should be restored to their proper place as members of the state, and that, although it would not be right to demand anything from them, it would be policy in the Catholics to allow an interference in church concerns to government, in order to obtain a greater good, viz., their political rights. A small portion of the Catholics were of the same opinion. A third party, which was indeed a very small portion of parliamentary friends, said, that not only ought the Catholics not be called upon to make those concessions, but that they would act unconstitutionally by consenting to make them, for they would thus increase the power of the crown, which was already too great. The great body of Catholics, with you, as its principal leader, adopted this maxim as their rule of conduct.

This is precisely the state of things now, but you are not at the head of this last party, you have left it, and have endeavoured to weaken and to draw it off to your side of concession!!!

Formerly the last party of which you were a leader, was in union with the bishops who declared that those concessions would essentially

injure, and might eventually destroy religion. The other parties worried the bishops to endeavour, by perseverence, to prevail upon them to unsay what they had said. The people, desirous of saving their pastors from the unpleasant situation in which those persons would place them, interposed. Mark that situation. The bishops felt that to make the concessions would be doing a permanent injury to religion. The party said, if the bishops make the concession, we shall obtain temporal advantages, and we will not appear to have done any injury to religion, for should any bad consequences follow, they will be attributable to the prelates, who ought to have withstood us, if we were wrong. We will therefore press upon them, if they are right they will resist us; if it is only a wish on their part to avoid minor evils, we will worry them into concession. Thus would the prelates in one case be liable to the perpetual reproach, from their own flock: "We are enslaved because you are obstinate;" and if the prelates relaxed, they would be charged by their own consciences, by the church at large, and by posterity, with the ruin of religion. To men like the Irish bishops, this was a most unpleasant dilemma. Their love for their flocks, their delicacy of feeling, the importunity of their Protestant friends, and of ambitious Catholics, the wishes of men in power, their confiding trust in plausible professions of men in honourable stations, and the sneers of the irreligious, all urged them to one line of conduct, and their consciences led them to another. They were, however, firm. But in order to draw off the squadrons which assailed them, you and the people declared: "That it was useless to annoy the prelates, for though there should be no objection upon the score of religion, you had objections on the score of the constitution; you would not for the bishops, nor for the Pope, nor for a general council, yield up to the crown an unconstitutional increase of power. We proclaimed that it would be useless therefore, to assail the bishops, until we should have been vanquished.

You were thus at that time nobly in advance for three great objects; the first to protect the liberties of the people from being injured by the concession of new influence to the crown, next to protect the church from the contaminating contact of a corrupt oligarchy, and lastly, to protect your prelacy from the perplexing dilemma which I have described. It was a glorious place, and well was it filled, and cheerfully did we support you. Though the oligarchy fought with judgment and persecuted us, the cause of the people made progress, slowly it is true, but steadily; your parliamentary friends were unmasked; your vacillating brethren were disabled; they withdrew from your meetings in sullen disappointment; you made better progress without them, as John

Keogh's shopkeepers did without the wretched aristocracy of 1792. Your cause became the cause of your country, the great subject of the nation's awe, of Europe's observation, and the topic of the world's inquiry. You stood pre-eminently, singularly high. Daniel O'Connell in Ireland, was compared to Simon Bolivar in South America. Your name was pronounced upon the Mississippi and echoed from the Ganges. At the head of a united people you went to the city of the British empire not to occupy a little seat amongst the buyers and the sellers, but to proclaim indignantly a nation's wrongs, and to demand firmly a people's rights: and lo! you descend from your elevation, and you permit the barter of the franchise of your constituents and the honour, the safety, and the purity of the Church of Christ, the glory of your nation, the religion of the world. And you, who used to lead the vanguard in attack, now take refuge behind the bishops, and you call upon Doctor Murray and upon Doctor Doyle to protect you! And their defence, to be efficacious, should be—that they approved of what they deprecated, and told you that they were pleased with what they did not wish for: and you tell the people to embrace what excited your own horror!!! Your other excuse is equally insufficient. You assert the Irish government, which persecutes you and suppresses your association, is friendly, and that the very people who are your opponents, are your supporters. Thus is Daniel O'Connell fallen!!! But fallen, I hope, to rise. He has placed the prelates in the very situation, to save them from which, he formerly sprang forward, and for doing which he gained what he has now placed in jeopardy. 'Tis but a bauble, it is true, but he valued it:—the applause of half the world.

But, perhaps, he will only permit a temporary evil to obtain a permanent good. That is, he will go into a dungeon, and permit manacles to be fastened on him, in the expectation that a government which has been long studying how those manacles might be put on, would be induced to take them off, merely for the asking. Surely he would not give this as a plea. He has a claim to be respected for his understanding.

How was Mr. O'Connell induced to act thus? Many persons say, that you spoke so much of your losses that it was plain you would accept of remuneration, and that your expectations were from your monarch. Could the most remote suspicion of such a possibility find access to my mind, I would spurn you as the last of men. And I scarcely know what evidence would even raise a doubt in my mind regarding your integrity. Forgive me for alluding to what I have been tortured at being obliged to hear. But it is almost equally pain-

ful for me to write what I must. I believe you either too easily yielded to the persuasions, the entreaties, the reasonings, if I may so call them, of your new acquaintances in England—men who know nothing of Ireland—or that you were artfully deluded by false parliamentary friends, who calculated upon one of two consequences—either your being able to gain over the people to their nefarious project, or your losing your influence in the attempt. Whichever it was, I call upon you to arise. In the first case, you would have ruined your country, in the second case, you would have ruined your reputation and lost your influence; and one of the most powerful of their opponents would have been disarmed without even the expense of his purchase. I call upon you to arise.

Believe me, my friend, the partner of your affection does not love your just fame more ardently than I do. But I love the wretched land which gave me birth; I love that religion in which are centered all my hopes; which contains all my treasures; which justly requires more, if possible, than all my affections, better—yes, better, far better, than I love you or your fame: my affection for you arose from my love of my country and of my religion. In you I found an identification to both; and the cold formalities of introduction were unknown between us. Some mutual impulse led us to almost adhesion, and frequently have I been astonished when I only imagined that I revolved about you, at finding that I had been imperceptibly to myself, borne also into the orbit of your progress round the bright luminary of civil and religious freedom.

He, whose property is creation, and whose is the perfection of justice and wisdom, has plucked me from your side and placed me where only a few transient shadows occasionally glide between me and the glorious centre. For myself I desire no change of system. But still mighty darkness involved your path; year after year, as you retraced your course, the gloom was seen to be more penetrable; your disk reflected its light with a less fiery and more steady ray; the nations hailed you; the aspirations of the good and of the great lit up with finer blaze the radiance whence you derived your brightness; the malignant demon who had been permitted to enshroud you, found that he could neither impede your progress, nor intercept your light; the prospect now was consoling; you had but to continue steadily in your path—when, lo! you have shot from your track; nothing can save you from ruin unless you return.

My friend, every obstacle to your emancipation was removed. Argument against you, there was none, but of bigotry an immense

accumulation; but though it assumed the garb of religion, the angel of investigation has, like Ithuriel, exhibited its deformity, and a world proclaims its condemnation. Self-interest concealed under the garb of patriotism, has been stripped of its disguise by an indignant nation; the calumniator who went round with the law and the gospel has been met and exposed. The rapacious tithe collector is known to be an unsparing destroyer, possessing scarcely the semblance of a sheep. The barbarity of the persecutors of our fathers has, by a just judgment, resulted in the ruin of his own offspring, and whatever the wishes of the remnant of your oppressors might me, their wants will compel them to demand your release from bondage, as smitten Egypt demanded the liberation of Israel. The rivers of Ireland have indeed been turned into blood; pernicious insects have destroyed its green productions; darkness has been brought upon the land; plague succeeding plague has only hardened your task-masters. May God soften their hearts and convert them to justice and mercy, lest an angel of destruction be sent through your land, and the prayer for your disenthralment be mingled with the wailing for the dead. Though the contemplation of the past would incline me to tremble for the accompaniments of the future, I can have no doubt as to the issue. Let me then entreat you; let me conjure you, whilst every symptom gives infallible token of the result; whilst the peers of England, the population of Ireland, the good sense of your own empire, and the prayers of the world are on your side, against an obstinate, but a substantial, vanquished foe; do not on the eve of your liberation, compromise the remnant of the liberties of Ireland, and the purity of your church.

Before I conclude, I must advert to one topic, upon which I perhaps will not be deemed presumptuous in giving an opinion. You have spoken in the highest terms of eulogy of the people of England. You who used to speak against them: upon this there is a serious change in your manner. I had my prejudices against the English nation, because of the wrongs inflicted upon my country and my religion, by the English government. But my residence in this country has removed that prejudice; you have seen the English people to more advantage than I beheld them, yet reasoning by analogy, I applaud in you this change of tone respecting the English people. I take a wide distinction between them and their government. The governors of England were criminal, the people comparatively free from blame. The English people were deceived. They were misled by the pulpit, by the press, by the theatre, by the legislature, by the writer of history, and by the writer of romance. So well-contrived, so general and

so successful a system of delusion never before existed as was that whose outline was drawn by Henry the Eighth, whose traces were better marked under Edward the Sixth, whose lines were shaded and whose tints were given by Elizabeth; Cecil perfected the figures; Spencer, Clarendon, and their followers added the drapery, and the eye accustomed to behold this, and this alone, and the ear continually filled with the panegyrics of the artists, and their superiority over the rest of mankind not being admitted as questionable, no wonder that a people taught to prize exclusively their deceivers, and to despise all others, were deceived.

The people of England abhor and detest, and you do as I abhor the atrocious original of what is exhibited to them as the Roman Catholic religion, and as the Irish character. But there never were originals. The painting is a gross delusion. Such delusions are not dissipated in a day. You may exhibit the original if you will: a question will naturally arise in the mind of the spectator, whether, as there must be deceit somewhere, it is not more natural to charge it upon you, than upon his early instructer. His pride will naturally turn to the aid of his early impression. Another topic which is most powerful will come in to add its force. His early instructer was a good, a virtuous man—must he now look upon him to have been base and deceitful, and you, and you only, as honest and well informed. It is suggested to him that as he was honestly in error, so was his instructer: the testimony of the world will prove this to have been the case. Still the human mind is tenacious of its early impressions. The people of England have been deceived, and so were the people of every English colony deceived as to what was really the Roman Catholic religion, and the character of the Irish people; and as the dominion of Britain was great, powerful, and extensive, so was this delusion very general. Her foreign possessions were like so many mirrors placed to reflect back upon Britain the rays which she had emitted, and as we found the people and the government opposed to us, we too hastily identified them. I was undeceived, by finding that where the British government had lost its power, the opinions which it had disseminated continued in full force; but as no penal law degraded me or chained me down, I had only to await patiently the issue of fair examination. I found that a people might in the sincerity of their hearts, hold that God never revealed what I had in unquestionable evidence that he did reveal, and yet admit me with perfect safety to a full participation of every civil right, and of every political advantage. Experience has taught them the superiority of the principle which leads to this result. Yet it is this plain observation, which is as

yet unintelligible to Great Britain. We know here of no hatred on the score of religion, though we are not less misunderstood, as to our tenets; you are not fit for the British constitution, because you are too democratic, and if you come here, you must not be surprised to hear from men who, upon other subjects, are not only well informed, but even erudite, that your religion disqualifies you for republicanism. The people of America have no disposition to persecute, although they have still as a body the very same notions of Popery, which are kept amongst the English; but America has scarcely had the opportunity of correcting her mistake. Explain to the English Protestants what you really are, show them that you are neither the slavish dolts which at one time Popery is said to have made you, nor the ferocious and sanguinary democrats that at another time Popery is said to have made you. From what I have seen the Protestants of England are not worse than the Protestants of America, and would not aid in your persecution if they were not misled.

Your plain course then is to conciliate your Protestant fellow-subjects by affectionate intercourse, by candid and manly explanation of what you really are, and by showing them that you love the constitution too well to obtain admission within its walls by making a new breach for your passage; that you would prefer longer endurance to forfeiting any portion of the popular rights, already to much infringed upon, and increasing the influence of a cabinet already too great.

Your body is now the most numerous religious division in the British empire; the Catholics of the empire are more numerous than the members of the established church, they are more numerous than the Presbyterians, more numerous than the Unitarians, more numerous than the Methodists; and evidently more numerous than any other one of the thousand other divisions, which are the consequences of the separation of the sixteenth century. Your fathers endured much and counted every loss as gain, that they might transmit to you an unshackled an uncontaminated church. Upon the mountain, in the morass, in the cavern, in the wood, they collected around their bishops, disguised and concealed from all but from their faithful and affectionate children. Discovered and immured, whilst they were bowed down in their dungeons, your fathers never worried them to make a compromise at the consequences of which they would shudder with horror. They fed, they consoled them, and if they could not defend them, they wept and were resigned. Perhaps from their mansions of glorious reward the holy confessors and martyrs now look down upon you. That you will not prove degenerate children of such men is the prayer of

Yours, sincerely, JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER ON THE RELATIONS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND FEUDALISM:

Addressed to His Excellency Governor Troup, of Georgia

[The Letter which follows, appeared in the *United States Catholic Miscellany* for September 9 and 16, 1826.]

To His Excellency Governor Troup, of Georgia.

Sir:—I feel no small share of regret at finding myself obliged to write what you have very thoughtlessly made necessary. I have just read your oration as it appeared in the Southern Recorder of the 15th of August. It is not because of the want of taste which you exhibited in your poetical selections; in the first of which you place before us the death of a tyrant preparatory to your discourse upon the death of Jefferson, and in the second you tell us that another such has fallen, because Adams is no more. Neither do I complain because in your effusion you do not manifest as much capacity for treating your subject as might be expected from much more humble aspirants to the fame of oratory. I shall not quarrel with you for the charge which you make upon General Washington and John Adams, or one of them, of having, during his Presidency, weakened and destroyed the Constitution; though the one is embalmed in the recollections of the wise and the good, and the other was the object of your panegyric. But my charge against you is that you have made a very wanton attack upon a large number of your fellow-citizens.

You have said that in the Declaration of Independence Mr. Jefferson embodied what was valuable of *Magna Charta*, the Bill of Rights, and Act of Settlement. Sir, a subsequent passage of yours, and of which I regret to know that you are the author, is the following:

"The political constitutions of Europe, the offspring of Feudalism and essentially despotic, were still more corrupted by an union with the constitution of the Roman Church. Priests came in aid of kings and nobles to multiply and perpetuate abuses, and the divine right and infallibility of royalty were preached by the successors of St. Peter, to make a mystery of government, and by impressing the hopelessness of reform, but through divine grace, to perpetuate the dominion of the few, and the vassalage of the many—when, therefore, it was said that government was no mystery, that rational beings are capable of self-government, that all men are equal, and that governors are but the servants of the people, created by and respon-

sible to the people, the promulgators of these obvious truths were decried as wild enthusiasts and visionary theorists, whose doctrines might amuse the multitude, but could never be reduced to practice.''

Under any circumstances, such a declaration coming from the mouth of the governor of one of the old thirteen states, must be galling to the Roman Catholics of America: but, sir, if the statement which you made be untrue, and if you have in this instance calumniated institutions, with whose nature and whose history you appear to have little or no acquaintance; the insulted Catholics will not be compensated for the injury which you have done them, even should they discover that you are an honourable man, who feel contrition for your offence; they may pardon you, but still they suffer.

Magna Charta, sir, was but a partial assertion of the rights of Englishmen against the feudal tyranny of their conquerors. Feudalism was introduced into England after the unfortunate overthrow at Hastings by William the Conqueror. Previously to this, the English had a free government, they had written charters, fixed laws, and well-defined principles: they also had in its full vigour the Roman Catholic religion; and the best guarantee and bulwark of their liberties was voluntarily given to them from conscientious conviction, and by the advice of bishops and priests, by a king whom the Roman Catholics generally revere as a saint. The laws of Edward the Confessor, sir, are at once the result of Catholic regal justice, and the best protection of British liberty. They are the collected excellence of the laws of a series of Catholic kings. Those of Kent, were promulgated first by Ethelbert in 602; and their enactment by which the fixed system of law was substituted for the monarch's or the witten's caprice was one of the first results of this king's conversion by priests sent from the Roman Church, by the successor of St. Peter. So early did they commence their labour to make government not mystery but law. His successor, Withred, in 696, continued their improvement; three years before, Ina had done the same for West Sex: and in 790, the Mercians received their laws from Offa. Alfred, who was not only a most religious and pious Roman Catholic, but a student in Ireland, and a learner at Rome, and a disciple of the Pope in the art of government, embodied the great principles of justice and of right which he found in those several codes, and in the laudable customs of his nation; and gave to all England her first national code of law, and is justly styled the father of British liberty. He also gave a special code to Guthrum, the Dane, who became a Roman Catholic, and made an alliance with him in 870 or 71, and by which this convert was to govern the Danish Catho-

lics who were permitted to remain in East Angle. Athelstan, Edmund, Edgar, and Ethelred, improved those laws: and from a conviction of its being his duty to secure for the people over whom he was called by their own free choice to reign, as much liberty and security as he could, Edward, the Confessor, compiled his code of laws. During this whole period, there was no feudal principle in England; they had free customs and fixed laws and allodial tenure.

Feudalism was established in several places upon the continent of Europe. I agree with you in stating that it was essentially despotic; but your excellency must have forgotten your historical researches when you made your next assertion, "that those feudal constitutions were still more corrupted by an union with the constitution of the Roman Church." Had your excellency condescended to write without ambiguity, I should have had less trouble in my answer. Gentlemen like you, perhaps, do not care to learn even obvious distinctions, where Popery is concerned: but, sir, the knowledge of the economy of even a nest of ants, would be no degradation. There is as obvious a distinction between the constitution of the Roman Church and that of the Roman Catholic Church, as there is between the constitution of the city of Washington and the constitution of the United States; but, perhaps, you never took the trouble of examining either the one or the other. Believe me, that your excellency would write and speak better upon any subject by being acquainted with its nature. If in your oration you meant what you said, the Roman Church, you made just as intelligible an assertion, as if you had gravely told your auditors, that the constitution of our colleges, essentially literary, became much better by an union with the constitution of the city of Washington. But if you meant the Roman Catholic Church, when you said "Roman Church," as I assume you did, you contradicted all history.

Sir, if you do not know, you, and every man in such a station as you fill, ought to know more of the history of the European governments than you exhibit; you ought to know, that feudalism, at its first establishment in Southern Europe, was not only despotic but ferocious, and that its spirit was softened by the Roman Catholic Church, and its usurpations were resisted and checked by that same church. I shall now glance at a few facts to which you have directed my attention, and confining myself to them, exhibit to you enough to make you feel that you have acted unwisely in venturing to attack a church of whose principles you know so little.

We have seen, sir, that England had not the feudal principles in her constitution at the time of King Edward the Confessor, who died

on the 5th of January, 1066. The Norman William soon found his sword had hewn a passage to the British throne. He preferred the Norman to the British principles; and first established the feudal tenure in the island; though in 1070 he confirmed the laws of Edward, yet through his whole reign his first object was to make the English nation submit to mitigated feudalism. The Church had before the conquest, held her possessions either by the allodial title or that of free-alms, but the great object of the Conqueror was to have the title to these lands, and all other rights to any temporalities which she held, dependent upon, and derived from the king, upon the feudal principle; in some instances he and his successors were able, by the dint of oppression, to force the clergy to a surrender of their ancient rights, and acceptance of a new feudal title for the whole or for a part, from his majesty. The old Saxons who did not accept of such titles when offered, were dispossessed, and Normans very gladly became feudal possessors in their stead. The laws of the Confessor and the ancient rights gradually fell into disuse or were superseded. Thus, during the reigns of the first two Williams, the two Henrys, Stephen, Richard, and John, there existed an almost ceaseless war between those monarchs and the church, in consequence of the resistance of the prelates to the kingly usurpations: the barons were generally awed or interested, and the people were enslaved; the clergy alone made resistance in a body, though frequently, for peace sake, some of that order, as they did at Clarendon to the second Henry, parted with much of their rights, and of the property of which they were but trustees; some, as Becket, lost their lives; and, as Langton, were driven into exile. This is not the picture of the constitution of the Church uniting with that of feudalism to make a despot more corruptly powerful. Will your excellency vouchsafe to accompany me to Runnymede? Who produced the old copy of Edward's laws, and taught the barons and the freemen their rights? Who brought them to the altar to swear that they would hold together and persevere in seeking the restitution of their rights? who stood forward to claim from John that restitution? and whose steady demand awed the crouching tyrant more than the gleaming of the armour which glittered on that field? It was Langton, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury. Thus, sir, whatever of good is to be found in Magna Charta, is due to the very people whom Governor Troup has wantonly insulted.

Feudalism was restrained in England by the Roman Catholic Church; and, sir, but that neither my leisure permits me, nor does the subject require it, I would show you the same result upon the Conti-

nent of Europe. We shall stay in England, sir, because you have chosen it for your ground. With the exception of the third Edward, there was scarcely a monarch who did not endeavour to make his feudal prerogative prevail over popular right, and in all those cases with scarcely an exception the king experienced the opposition of the church; until in the ferocity of his rage and lust, the eighth Henry laid that church prostrate at his feet, because it would not sacrifice eternal truth to his beastly passions. This, may it please your excellency, was the commencement of the religious reformation of England. Now indeed for the first time the principle of feudalism gave to the British monarch everything he sought; he was now lord paramount in church and state. Need I inform Governor Troup what immediate consequences flowed from this usurpation? The Parliament became a mere mockery, the royal proclamation had the force of law; any freeman who sought to obtain the benefit of the *Great Charter* was transmitted to a dungeon; no charter was a title; did any bishop dare to raise his voice to vindicate his right, he was sent to the scaffold; an honest chancellor's fate was to be similar. Under Edward the Sixth, the Bishop's commission might be superseded. Thus, sir, the genuine principle of perfect feudalism was established in England, only upon the destruction of the constitution of the Roman Catholic Church: and a more obedient set of gentlemen to the powers that be, has never been exhibited to the world, than in the substitutes for those turbulent prelates who contended for their ancient rights, and chartered property. Every semblance of liberty, save the shadow of a Parliament was now lost: when the Bill of Rights was introduced and passed, it was but an attempt to restore long-lost liberties which had been tyrannically trampled upon contrary to the laws, usages, and principles of the ancient, Catholic, English people. Those enumerated and enacted in the Act of Settlement are no more. The Roman Catholic Church has no principle in her constitution, no tenet in her doctrines, no custom in her discipline which teaches or implies that a king reigns by divine right. When kings state that they rule by the grace of God, they mean by his favour or kindness, as the word implies. You need not go to religion for its meaning, and certainly not to the Roman Catholic religion to explain that it is by a supernatural gift or favour of God that George the Fourth now persecutes Roman Catholics. As I suppose you are a classical scholar, you must know that the words *gratia Dei* are a generic expression, which, according to the context are to be translated either the kindness of God regarding a temporal or a spiritual benefit: the Roman Catholic Church never classed the possession of a crown and

sceptre amongst her sacraments. If your excellency means to speak or to write upon those subjects again, it would be well if you took the pains to study them; because I believe the Almighty never promised to give historical, or classical, or legal information, to kings or to governors by mere inspiration. Thus, sir, if Mr. Jefferson drew up, with consummate felicity, an excellent declaration, "embodying what is valuable in *Magna Charta,* the Bill of Rights, and Act of Settlement," it is no disparagement to his genius to assert, that the two latter only "invigorated and restored" what had been previously given in Magna Charta, but the force of that charter was impaired by feudalism, to which the Roman Catholic Church gave opposition, and which feudalism, by the destruction of that church, got full vigour to destroy the charter; and that this charter was obtained and established by the Roman Catholics in opposition to a feudal tyrant, and was but the imperfect restitution of what Roman Catholics had created and enjoyed by the aid of their church, before a feudal conqueror robbed them of their rights; and that the English Roman Catholic clergy endured their greatest hardships, because of their opposition to feudal tyrants.

Your excellency having, in defiance of all records, stated in reference to England, that Roman Catholic priests came in to aid kings and nobles in perpetuating and multiplying as well as establishing the abuse of feudalism, I come to examine your other assertions.

"The Divine right and infallibility of royalty were preached by the successors of St. Peter, to make a mystery of government, and by impressing the hopelessness of reform but through divine grace to perpetuate the dominion of the few and the vassalage of the many."

Your sentence is wretchedly constructed; but still we can discover your meaning. Will you please to inform us what successor of St. Peter preached the divine right of kings? Have not the Popes been generally accused of asserting that kings held their crowns from the Holy See, and not from God; by papal, not by divine right? What successor of Peter ever preached or taught the infallibility of kings? Have they not been generally accused of acting towards kings not only as if their majesties were fallible, but criminal? Have they not been at war with kings? Have they not deposed kings? What page of history, what record, what fact has exhibited to your excellency that they preached that government was a mystery? I have sometimes heard of the Popes stating that a king reigned by divine right: but I have never heard or read that any Pope preached such a doctrine, until I read it in your oration; but for you was reserved the high distinction of being I believe the first public authority to charge the Pope with

preaching that kings are infallible. There are some persons, may it please your excellency, hold as an opinion, that some of our state governors imagine themselves to be infallible; perhaps there were in former times kings who really had as high notions of their own good sense and were as tenacious of their own opinions as any of our governors; the obstinacy of such kings might also have caused considerable loss of territory to their states. Believing such men as these, the Pope, who may also err in his views of human nature, or mistake the dispositions of individuals, as I find I have done as regards you; he might have either taken their assertion of their own infallibility as evidence of the fact, or he might have inferred their opinion of themselves from their conduct; nor is it to be presumed that a man who continues to act as if he was assured of his infallibility, does imagine himself liable to error. Be that as it may, sir, your assertion of the Pope teaching that kings were infallible, is to me a totally new piece of information. I am so anxious to add to my stock of knowledge, that you will confer a great favour on me by informing the editor of the *Catholic Miscellany* which of the Popes taught this doctrine, and he has promised to publish it as soon as you transmit the information. However, your excellency has placed the Pope in a very awkward position; for whilst you made him preach that the king was infallible, you made him hold out a hope to the people who were injured by the infallible king, that they would be redressed by the same king when the grace of God should have led him to repair the evils produced by his infallibility. Really, it requires more penetration than I can lay claim to, to reconcile this and this. These Popes have always been a very inconsistent race of beings! Now, sir, as I am no advocate for the divine right of kings, believing also that they have no claim to infallibility, I promise you for the name of every Pope whom you shall specify to the editor of the *Miscellany,* who preached in support of the divine right of kings, I will give to him, for you, the names of two Protestant bishops who have preached the same doctrine; but, Governor, we must have it a good close bargain: you must not only give the name of the Pope, but the passages of the sermon, and I will not only give the names of the bishops, but the passages of their sermons. It will be as well to inform you that unless you produce extracts from the sermons of seven Popes, I shall be victorious. I doubt that you can produce a single passage. Yet there were some Popes who held the doctrine, but not in the way that you appear to insinuate; like the *gratia Dei*, the *jure divino* has a meaning which a little more examination into the law of nations, the feudal system, and Christian morality would exhibit, and which even

natural religion, or the *jus divinum naturale,* would establish for yourself as long as the constitution of Georgia permits it, and no longer. But, sir, I consent that we shall not construe the passages of sermons on either side upon this sound principle; those which I have will not admit such construction; it is for you to say what construction your passages will require.

Now, your excellency must admit that in revolting against King George III., Mr. Jefferson and his associates were aided by a Catholic king, the eldest son of the Roman Catholic Church; and the revolt was against a Protestant king who persecuted Roman Catholics for not swearing that they would desert and reject the Pope. Yet, with admirable facility, with a tact peculiar to yourself, you give as the prelude to your insult upon the Roman Catholics, and your assertions regarding the Pope, a declaration that it was the most inveterate of the enemies of Rome, was the superstitious Protestant despot.

"Mr. Jefferson had already done enough for his country and for his own fame —he had marched with his comrades in the vanguard of freedom, had palsied the arm of despotism, broken the chains of superstition, declared the independence of his country, and promulgated the natural, imprescriptible, and unalienable rights of man."

In doing all which he was aided by Roman Catholics!! A Roman Catholic signature to his declaration pledged not only life and sacred honour, but a million of money; General Washington testified that no blood was more freely shed in defence of Mr. Jefferson's principles, than that of Roman Catholics: the king of a Catholic nation, the king of all others most attached to Rome, sent his fleets and armies to be the copartners in palsying the despot's arm, and breaking the chains of superstition. What superstition? Certainly not Roman Catholic; because there was no Catholic superstition to enchain any person whom Mr. Jefferson had freed. What then does it mean? Protestant superstition! Be it so, if you will. It is not my province to contend with you that it was not. But if so, I ask you, why you attack the Pope and the Roman Catholic Church in the next paragraph? Come, Governor, honestly declare that you used the words as many of our fellow-citizens use them every day, merely for their sound, and without considering whether they had reason or not. Why would you then carelessly insult a large portion of your fellow-citizens? I have done.

Yours,

A Roman Catholic.

LETTER CONCERNING THE MATTINGLY MIRACLE

Addressed to the Archbishop of Baltimore

But they going forth preached everywhere the Lord working withal, and confirming the word with signs that followed.—*Mark* xvi. 20.

CHARLESTON, S. C., Jan. 23, 1830.

To the Most Rev. James Whitfield, D.D., Archbishop of Baltimore, and so forth.

Most Rev. Sir:—Having been peculiarly struck with the evidence in the case of Mrs. Mattingly's restoration to health, I requested as a favour your permission, as the occurrence took place in the diocess over which you preside, to examine it specially, for my own satisfaction, and to publish my opinion after close inquiry, and mature reflection. You were pleased to consent.

My first wish was to converse again with Mrs. Mattingly herself: I had previous conversations with her in the latter end of December, 1825, and the beginning of January, 1826, and with several of the other witnesses to the principal facts of her case. I was also desirous of procuring the supplemental affidavits which are now for the first time published. And I might perhaps, better state here the reason of their not having sooner appeared.

When I was in Washington, about four years since, I was accompanied by my sister, who had much more conversation with Mrs. Mattingly than my opportunities then allowed; after our departure for the South, she stated to me her surprise that no more special mention was made in the published documents of what she considered to be the most palpable evidence of the miraculous nature of that lady's cure, viz., the sudden healing of an ulcerated back. The statement was perfectly new to me, and I asked particularly respecting the evidence: she mentioned to me her having had the information from Mrs. Mattingly, and from, I believe, one of her sisters: I immediately wrote to Mrs. M. and requested such affidavits as the nature of the case would require or admit. Soon afterwards I received a letter from Captain Carbery, the brother of Mrs. M., covering the affidavit. I mislaid this document, and was now anxious to make more particular inquiry, not only respecting the

fact and its circumstances, but to see and examine the witnesses, and to learn the cause of this omission, when the original depositions were taken.

I also was desirous of hearing again the verbal relation from the principal witnesses, and of investigating upon the spot more fully for my own satisfaction: for though my mind had been long previously convinced of the truth of the facts, and of their miraculous nature, I judged it but prudent to take this step in order to discover whether the process would disclose any ground or doubt or more fully confirm my previous impressions.

Having had several conversations with Mrs. Mattingly, her sisters, her uncle's widow, and some of the other witnesses, I received the very same explanation which had previously been given, viz.: that it was not considered necessary to enter into every minute detail, and that many circumstances of this most extraordinary case were passed over, some, through delicacy, and some, not to overload with too many particulars, the narrative and testimony already greatly burdened with facts and repetition. I found that a great many of the original witnesses, and several other respectable persons with whom I conversed, had been always fully aware of the fact related by my sister, and of many others, the knowledge of which might increase the satisfaction of the believer, but would not convince persons for whom the published documents were insufficient.

I have myself been put in possession of much more of the same description; and upon being consulted by Mrs. Mattingly, I gave it as my opinion that there was no necessity for the publication, at present, of more than what is contained in the original documents and the four supplemental affidavits which I then procured. Before I close this little work, I shall state to you that although they contain more than enough of evidence to prove the existence of a splendid miracle, they do not contain all that might be adduced. I shall, however, of course, in the argument, confine myself strictly and exclusively to them, as if they did contain the entire—as I have no right to call upon any one to draw a conclusion more extensive than will be supplied by the premises which have been furnished.

I submit, then, that the following statement is fully upheld in all its parts by the documents, and that the testimony of their witnesses is every way unimpeachable—of course that the statement itself is an exact history of facts, and the facts being admitted as true, the miraculous nature of the occurrence is evident.

"A. M. The subject of the following case, was a married lady, about thirty-

four years of age; of industrious habits, even temper, and cheerful disposition. During the summer of 1817, she experienced some painful sensations in the left side, which gradually increased in severity, at length became concentrated upon the lower and outer part of the left mamma: upon examination of which, she discovered a hard and deep-seated tumour of the size of a pigeon's egg, which soon became so sensible, that the lightest touch of her finger, or pressure of her clothes, occasioned severe pain. In the month of September of this year, three medical gentlemen examined the tumour, and two of them agreed that it was of a schirrous nature. One of them recommended immediate extirpation, which recommendation, however, was not acted upon. External applications of hemlock and mercurial ointment were applied; and other remedies (which are not mentioned) were prescribed: but the tumour was not dispersed, nor were the pains allayed by the treatment. No material change however of her general health occurred, until the Monday after Easter-Monday, A. D., 1818, when she was seized with a violent vomiting; which recurring at intervals for several hours, a physician was called in, and prescribed for her. After some days, her disease assuming a more alarming aspect, another physician was called in consultation: a course of mercury was determined on; and a salivation of several weeks' continuance was kept up, without the patient at all being benefitted thereby.

"The tumour now became more and more painful. The patient compared her sensations to what she imagined she would feel, if her side were bored with an auger, pinched with forceps, or cut with sharp instruments. Pains such as these she constantly experienced from about the month of March, 1818: in addition to which, sudden and acute pains would occasionally radiate in every direction from the inflamed spot, causing her agonies, which are indescribable. From the permanent contraction of the pectoralis-major, the left arm was kept applied to the side, and by its pressure greatly aggravated her sufferings. Constant pains were felt also under the scapula, and in the shoulder and arm of the left side.

"During this time, she frequently vomited large quantities of grumous blood, and highly offensive matter, which often threatened instant suffocation; and were accompanied with cramps of her stomach, breast, and limbs, cold sweats, and cold extremities. Great debility and frequent syncopes followed these discharges; and on some occasions her prostration was so extreme, that her attendants resorted to artificial means of ascertaining if her respiration continued. The attending physician believed that the hæmorrhage was vicarious; nor did he abandon this opinion until convinced by Mrs. M. that the functions of the uterus (except when she was very much reduced) continued to be performed.

"The violence of these symptoms occasionally abating, she employed herself in sewing or in knitting. She was generally confined to her chamber or bed: on one occasion venturing to walk a very short distance (say ten yards) out of doors, this effort was immediately followed by violent hæmatemesis. During the exacerbations of her disease (which lasted several weeks, and returned repeatedly in a year,) her stomach would retain no solid food whatever; and often the tea or coffee, upon which principally, she subsisted during these exacerbations, was instantly rejected, mixed with blood and offensive matter.

"She constantly felt a tightness across her chest, an internal smarting and burning, and great thirst. She had no appetite, and was always sensible of a very disagreeable taste in her mouth. Her tongue was hard, rough, dry, and dark-colored; and her breath insupportably offensive.

"The medical treatment during this time was only palliative. Laudanum appearing to afford more relief than any other remedy, was given *ad libitum*; but the system becoming gradually accustomed to its operation, it at length produced no effect, even when taken in large doses.

"The above is a very faint outline of the sufferings of Mrs. M. from the period of their incubation (the summer of 1817) to about the month of September, 1823; during which time she exercised a Christian fortitude, and practised an habitual piety and resignation, truly edifying and consolatory to her relatives and friends.

"About this time, (the summer of 1823,) a hard and incessant cough supervened, attended with hæmoptysis; and frequently provoking by its obstinacy attacks of hæmatemesis, which threatened immediate strangulation, and reduced her to the lowest ebb of life. In the month of February, 1824, a regular chill and fever came on about 4 o'clock every afternoon.

"From long confinement to a recumbent posture, the shoulders and loins of the patient became ulcerated.

"The attending physician repeatedly declared that her 'case was out of the reach of medicine;' and prescribed only palliatives. The sulphate of quinine was tried, but the stomach rejecting it, it was discontinued, and laudanum in large doses repeated. On the night of the 9th of March, 1824, *tinnitus aurium*, and an almost inaudible voice, appeared to be the precursors of dissolution. Between four and five o'clock, A. M., of the 10th of March, to the astonishment and even terror of her friends, she asked for her stockings, drew them on, and left her bed; and excepting her loss of flesh and colour, seemed to be suddenly restored to health. The tumour had disappeared; the ulcers of her back had healed, without leaving a vestige (not even a cicatrix) of their late ravages. Her breath, lately so intolerably fetid and disgusting, was become pleasant; and a sweet taste substituted for the very disagreeable one which had so long existed in her mouth. She could now use her left arm as well as ever; and could throw it into any posture she chose, without occasioning the slightest pain. In fine, she proved to be suddenly restored to health; and, immediately underwent the fatigue of receiving the visits of hundreds of persons, who crowded to sée her, without exhaustion or inconvenience. From that time to the present she has continued to enjoy excellent health; and with many others, is a living witness to the truth of these statements.

"She and her attendants being questioned, denied that any abscess had discharged whether internally or externally; and asserted that the tumour continued to the moment of her restoration, increased in size, hard, inflamed, and painful."

I shall here inform you, that this history was not drawn up by me, nor under my supervision. Upon my return hither, I put all the documents into the hands of a respectable Protestant physician, and requested of him to draw from them such a statement as his own judgment would suggest. After carefully studying them, he compiled the above relation. I then divided it myself into its several propositions, and carefully noted the passages of the several documents by which each proposition was sustained; and seeing the impossibility of evading their single or collected truth, I addressed to the highly respectable

and numerous body of our physicians in this place the following circular, accompanying the statement itself:

"The following case is respectfully submitted to the medical faculty of Charleston, with a full conviction of the perfect and absolute truth of the facts, therein stated.

"I would take it as a great favour, to be informed whether, in the supposition of that truth, the gentlemen of the faculty, or any of them, can account for the sudden restoration upon any natural principle.

"In submitting the case, I must state that there existed a circumstance which could not, by any means, either naturally produce or aid in naturally producing the result, but which is calculated to lead to the conclusion that the effect was produced by the miraculous interference of the Creator. Upon this I propose no question. I merely request to be informed whether the faculty can assign any sufficient or probable natural cause for the restoration—taking the following as a fair and full statement of the whole case. Respectfully,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*"

I had one parcel left with the secretary of the Medical Society: and after each member of the faculty had been furnished with a copy, the question was put at their regular meeting, whether the subject should be taken up. I am not quite certain whether more than one physician was in favour of the discussion, but I know that the only Roman Catholic in the society stated to me that he was convinced of the miraculous nature of the restoration, and desired to have it taken up by his brethren, but it was not examined.

I had another parcel left with the dean of the faculty of our Medical College, for the professors. I ascertained from the gentleman, upon inquiry, that the parcel had been received, but he has not thought fit to state anything farther to me upon the subject.

I shall now proceed to show the witnesses by whom each assertion is sustained, making reference to the documents by their numbers.

The first assertion is merely a description of the lady. "The subject of the following case was a married lady, about thirty-four years of age: of industrious habits, even temper, and cheerful disposition." This is sustained by the affidavit of Captain Carbery, who also adds "that she enjoyed excellent health, till the sickness alluded to in the statement marked A;" as also by the testimony of Sybilla, the widow of General Henry Carbery, the uncle of Mrs. Mattingly, who adds "that she was healthy till about the summer of 1817," and that "she had been intimately acquainted with her during about thirty years;"

likewise by Mrs. Anne Maria Fitzgerald, a respectable lady, who was intimately acquainted with her during about fourteen years.

The second assertion is the general description of the commencement of her sickness; and it might be considered, as regarding the length of time that sickness continued, as well as the manner in which its manifestation began. The testimony to both these points is plain and abundant. I shall recite the witnesses, referring to the documents. Mrs. Mattingly herself to both; Captain Carbery; Doctor Jones, who certifies the statement A, besides his certificate to both; Ruth Carbery and Catherine Carbery to both; Doctor Alexander M'Williams both; Lewis Carbery both; Reverend William Matthews to both, save that he only knew of the lump by her relation, and not by inspection; Mrs. Baker as to the lump or tumour, which she felt; also Christiana Hobbs. These witnesses establish, that "during the summer of 1817 she experienced some painful sensations in the left side, which, gradually increasing in severity, at length became concentrated upon the lower and outer part of the left mamma; upon examination of which, she discovered a hard and deep-seated tumour, of the size of a pigeon's egg, which soon became so sensible, that the slightest touch of her finger, or pressure of her clothes, occasioned severe pain." Their testimony is generally supported by the depositions of Sybilla Carbery, Jane Rose, Maria Anne Booth, Anne Maria Fitzgerald, Mary Hopewell, James Carbery, Jane M. Andrews, Eliza Cassin, Doctor James W. Roach, Captain James Hoban, Reverend Joseph Carbery, Mr. James M'Williams, and Miss E. M'Williams, Reverend Anth. Kohlmann, and Mrs. Mary H. Fitzgerald. These latter, added to the first ten, give us twenty-five witnesses of various ages, professions, religions, and of both sexes, all of very respectable standing in society, well known for probity, honour, and unimpeachable deportment. If we add to this the testimony of the other witnesses, who either occasionally or only latterly saw Mrs. Mattingly, and consider the notoriety of her case, she not being an obscure person, but the sister of the mayor of our federal city, residing near the presidential mansion, and in the vicinity of the public offices of the United States, and under the eyes, I may say the observation of some of the most distinguished public officers, and her attending physician, the present postmaster of the city of Washington, we can desire no stronger. I have spoken with several of the most creditable persons in public and private life, in that city, upon the subject, and not one ever expressed a doubt as to the duration or character of the disease.

I now come to its history. The next assertion is, that "in the

month of September of this year, three medical gentlemen examined the tumour, and two of them agreed that it was of a schirrous nature. One of them recommended immediate extirpation, which recommendation, however, was not acted upon. External applications of hemlock and mercurial ointment were applied; and other remedies (which are not mentioned) were prescribed; but the tumour was not dispersed, nor were the pains allayed by this treatment." To maintain this, we have the testimony of Mrs. Mattingly, Doctor Jones, Dr. M'Williams, and Lewis Carbery, severally to the several parts of the allegation.

Our next statement is, that "no material change, however, of her general health occurred until the Monday after Easter-Monday, A. D. 1818, when she was seized with a violent vomiting, which, recurring at intervals for several hours, a physician was called in, and prescribed for her. After some days, her disease assuming a more alarming aspect, another physician was called in consultation; a course of mercury was determined on; and a salivation of several weeks continuance was kept up, without the patient being at all benefited thereby." This is upheld by Mrs. Mattingly, the document A, sustained by the certificates of Doctor Jones, by Sybilla Carbery, Lewis Carbery, Doctor Jones, and Jane M. Andrews, taking all their statements in the general result.

"The tumour now became daily more and more painful. The patient compared her sensations to what she imagined she would feel, if her side were bored with an auger, pinched with forceps, or cut with sharp instruments. Pains such as these, she constantly experienced from about the month of March, 1818: in addition to which, sudden and acute pains would occasionally radiate in every direction from the inflamed spot, causing her agonies which are indescribable." The testimony of Mrs. Mattingly, of Miss Fitzgerald, of the Reverend Anthony Kohlmann, and of the Reverend S. L. Dubuisson, exhibit the truth of this statement.

That "during this time, she frequently vomited large quantities of grumous blood and highly offensive matter, which threatened instant suffocation," will be at once perceived by reference to Mrs. Mattingly's own statement, to that of Captain Carbery, the statement A, the affidavits of Mrs. Sybilla Carbery, Miss A. M. Fitzgerald, James Carbery, Lewis Carbery, the certificates of Doctor Jones, and of Doctor M'Williams: this latter gentleman adds what I have been told by several others who saw her frequently, "that nothing could be more offensive than the effluvia from her breath." The following witnesses also testify to the continued vomiting of blood and matter, viz: Christiana Hobbs, Mary Jane Andrews, Jane Rose, Eliza

Miller, Harriet Miller, and Eliza Berryman, Catherine N. Cleary, who describes it as "sometimes so clotted as to appear like liver," Mrs. Baker, Justice Wharton, George Sweeny, Reverend Anthony Kohlmann, Reverend S. L. Dubuisson, and Reverend William Matthews: twenty-one in all.

That on these occasions, these sufferings "were accompanied with cramps of the stomach, breast, and limbs," we are informed by herself, Sybilla Carbery, Anne Maria Fitzgerald, James Carbery, Christiana Hobbs, Mary Jane Andrews, Mary H. Fitzgerald, Jane Rose, Reverend William Matthews.

The next assertion is, that "great debility and frequent syncopes followed these discharges, and on some occasions her prostration was so extreme, that her attendants resorted to artificial means of ascertaining if her respiration continued." To omit her own testimony, we have to these points that of her brother, the mayor, the statement A, Miss Anne Maria Fitzgerald, who often thought her "actually dead," James Carbery, Lewis Carbery, Christiana Hobbs, Mary Jane Andrews, Anne Booth, Catherine N. Cleary.

The next statement regarding the supposed nature of the hæmorrhage, is made by Doctor Jones.

The description of her occupation in the intervals of lesser suffering, and the hæmatemesis from the least exertion, are found stated by herself in the document A, by James Carbery, and Lewis Carbery, as is also the remaining assertion in the same clause. "The violence of these symptoms occasionally abating, she employed herself in sewing or knitting. She was generally confined to her chamber or bed: on one occasion, venturing to walk a very short distance (say ten yards) out of doors, this effort was immediately followed by violent hæmatemesis." The remaining part of this paragraph will be seen upheld not only by her own testimony, but by that of her two sisters, of her aunt, and of the Reverend S. L. Dubuisson. "During the exacerbations of her disease (which lasted several weeks, and returned repeatedly in a year,) her stomach would retain no solid food whatever; and often the tea or coffee, upon which principally she subsisted during these exacerbations, was instantly rejected, mixed with blood and offensive matter."

It is upon her own testimony, that we must principally rely for the description of her feelings: "she constantly felt a tightness across her chest, an internal smarting, and great thirst." But the evidence is upheld by the concurrent testimony of most of the other witnesses, informing us of what they observed, and what she occasionally described.

The state of her tongue is given by herself, as not only "parched with a constant fever," but it seemed to her to be as "hard and rough as a nutmeg-grater;" and "she had constantly a bad and disagreeable taste in her mouth." Her brother says, "her tongue was hard, rough, and dark." I have been told myself by several respectable persons, that, for a considerable time, they found it extremely unpleasant and offensive to the smell to pass by her chamber door. Doctor M'Williams states that her sufferings "gave every reason to conclude that the disease was making rapid progress on the internal organs, as nothing could be more offensive than the effluvia from her breath."

"The medical treatment during this time was only palliative. Laudanum appearing to afford more relief than any other, was given, *ad libitum*; but the system becoming gradually accustomed to its operation, it at length produced no effect, even when taken in large doses.

"The above is but a very faint outline of the sufferings of Mrs. Mattingly from the period of their incubation (the summer of 1817) to about the month of September, 1823, during which time she exercised a Christian fortitude, and practised a habitual piety and resignation, truly edifying and consolatory to her relatives and friends."

Doctor Jones, Doctor M'Williams, Captain Carbery, the document A, Captain Hoban, and the Reverend William Matthews, sustain the first part of this statement, and the aggregate of the witnesses uphold the second part.

We now come to the latter state of the patient.

"About this time, (the summer of 1823,) a hard and incessant cough supervened, attended with hæmoptysis; and frequently provoking, by its violence and obstinacy, attacks of hæmatemesis, which threatened immediate strangulation, and reduced her to the lowest ebb of life. In the month of February, 1824, a regular chill and fever came on about 4 o'clock every afternoon."

"From long confinement to a recumbent posture, the shoulders and loins of the patient became ulcerated." The entire of this is proven by her own affidavits, by those of her sisters. Moreover, the first clause has the additional testimony of Doctor Jones, Captain Carbery, Miss Fitzgerald, James Carbery, Lewis Carbery, Captain Hoban, partly by Doctor Carroll, fully by Miss Andrews, Miss Fitzgerald, Mrs. Rose, Miss Cleary, Justice Wharton, Reverend Anthony Kohlmann, Reverend S. L. Dubuisson, and Reverend William Matthews, and the latter part by Mrs. Sybilla Carbery.

I have now, Most Reverend sir, made very tedious references to the several affidavits and certificates, which clearly prove the entire of

the statement to this point, in the most full, plain, and satisfactory manner. Such a body of witnesses has seldom been arrayed for the purpose of satisfying the public mind. Most if not all of them are still living. I have more than once seen and conversed with several of them myself upon the spot. I have spoken with some of the judges in whose presence they were sworn, and I unhesitatingly assert, that a more respectable aggregate of witnesses, to any series of facts, never came under my observation. They exhibit the case in much stronger colours than my medical friend has thought proper to lay on his statement, for it was judged more correct and prudent to keep far within the bounds which the nature of the case allowed than to attempt overstepping them, especially where they were so ample as to cover more space than was requisite to prove the miraculous nature of the occurrence.

I shall now make special exhibition of the state of Mrs. Mattingly, just previous to her restoration; after giving the opinion not only of physicians, but of several other judicious friends, as to the character of the disease.

"The attending physician repeatedly declared 'her case was out of the reach of medicine;' and prescribed only palliatives. The sulphate of quinine was tried, but the stomach rejecting it, it was discontinued, and laudanum, in large doses, repeated. On the night of the 9th March, 1824, *tinnitus aurium*, and an almost inaudible voice, appeared to be the precursors of dissolution."

Mrs. Mattingly states in the supplement to No. 1, "I had long expected the hour when Almighty God, in his mercy, would deliver me from my sufferings, by withdrawing me from a world to me a scene of misery."

Thomas Carbery—"He consulted with many physicians about her complaint. They generally pronounced it an internal cancer, and all of them unhesitatingly declared that it would kill her, and that no medicines or external applications would, in their opinion, prolong her life." "For some time before her restoration, the whole system was prostrated. The severity of the cancer had almost deprived her of the power to articulate; the left side and arm were very much contracted, her pulse scarcely perceptible to the nicest touch. She could not move herself in the bed."

Ruth Carbery and Catharine Carbery—"Upon several occasions they thought she was dying, and said the departing prayers by her." About three weeks before her recovery, "She manifestly appeared to be growing much worse than they had ever seen her; all the symptoms of her case appearing to indicate that her death was fast approaching, and

that up to the very moment before her sudden restoration to perfect health, these symptoms seemed more and more alarming."

Sybilla Carbery—"That she always understood her disease to have been an internal cancer, and that so far as she has been capable of judging of the nature and severity of her case, no medicine or medical skill could have restored her to health, or given her any but very temporary relief"—"that for three weeks preceding her recovery, she was constantly with her, and during that time, expected every day would be her last."

Miss A. M. Fitzgerald—"Her sight was so much impaired at times, that she told me she could hardly recognise me; and for the last few days she complained of a constant noise in her head, resembling the tolling of bells, which affected her hearing very much." "In the afternoon of the 9th I visited her, and remained with her until the next morning. During the evening she requested me to bathe her head with vinegar, as she said she felt a violent pain in it; and she said she believed mortification had taken place, as she felt unusual kind of pains in her side and breast."

James Carbery—"Always believed from the commencement that her disease was mortal." He saw for the last time in her illness, on Monday the 8th of March, having staid with her through the preceding afternoon and night. "She was reduced to the very last extremity of life."

Lewis Carbery—"That on Monday the 8th of March, he was in his sister's room nearly the whole day, and saw her during the afternoon so entirely divested of all signs of life, as to induce him to believe that she was dead. That she continued in this state for about ten or fifteen minutes, and on showing signs of life by strangling, and being raised in the bed, a quantity of blood ran from her mouth." "That he always understood it to be the opinion of the physicians who have visited her, or were consulted on the subject, that the disease of his sister was an internal cancer, and that they believed her case to be out of the power of medicine."

Captain Hoban, on the 4th of March, "was informed that Mrs. Mattingly had expressed a desire to see him; he visited her in her chamber, and found her there in a more deplorable state, if possible, than he had ever before seen her; and she appeared to be almost suffocated, struggling for breath, and almost deprived of life." "Having no hope of Mrs. Mattingly being able to speak to him, he withdrew, under the strong belief that she could not survive."

Doctor Jones "concurred" with Doctor M'Williams, who "was of

opinion that her case was hopeless, and simply advised the use of palliatives." "Notwithstanding our opinion that the disease was not within the control of medicine, I continued to call occasionally." On the 1st of March, 1824, "the sulphate of quinine was directed, but her attendants stated that a very inconsiderable portion of it was retained; it was discontinued, and the laudanum in large doses repeated. I continued my visits to the 5th, and believing anodynes only indicated, I did not see her again till Wednesday the 10th."

Doctor M'Williams—"On conferring with Doctor Jones, I freely gave it as my opinion that her case was hopeless, and that palliatives were all that was left for this pious and excellent woman in her languishing condition; in which opinion Doctor Jones fully concurred."

Doctor Carrol "accidentally saw her at her brother's in the fall of 1823, and she seemed to him to be then in a hopeless state of disease, and beyond the power of medical aid."

Christiana Hobbs—"Two days before her restoration she saw Mrs. Mattingly, and found her, if possible, worse than she had ever seen her, and evincing every sign of speedy dissolution."

Jane Rose—"Those words she spoke at intervals when it was in her power to articulate, and I frequently had to put my ear close to her mouth, for she spoke in a tone so low as to be scarcely perceptible."

Eliza Cassin, who saw her on the 8th of March, received answer, on the 9th, to an inquiry, "She was as ill as she could be to be alive."

Eliza Miller, Harriet Miller, and Louisa Berryman—"On the 9th of March, late in the evening, paid a visit to Mrs. Mattingly and were under the impression that she was in a dying condition. Miss Eliza Miller and Miss Louisa Berryman assisted in waiting on her in a fit of fainting, and Miss Eliza Miller once ran down for the Rev. Mr. Matthews, believing that Mrs. Mattingly was at that moment breathing her last."

Catharine N. Cleary says "She had entirely lost the use of her left arm, and was reduced to the very verge of the grave. I saw her on the 8th of March, in the most agonizing pain, during which time she swooned twice in endeavoring to vomit, and was insensible so long, that I did not think she would ever recover."

Justice Wharton—"On Monday, the 8th March, saw Mrs. Mattingly for the last time before her miraculous restoration to health. She appeared to manifest the most unequivocal signs of a speedy departure. Her voice was so weak, that he could hardly hear her utter a word, even though his ear was applied closely to her mouth. Her hands were so cold, and she seemed to be rapidly approaching the last moment

of her existence. Her cough, though much weakened, was almost incessant, and the blood which she threw from her stomach was so fetid, as to almost render a station by her bedside insupportable."

George Sweeny—"Several times during the year last past had been in the chamber of Mrs. Mattingly, and always entertained the opinion that no human skill could restore her to health."

Reverend Joseph Carbery, during the period of her illness, "always left Washington with the impression that he should never see his sister again, believing with those who knew her, that her case was incurable, and that she could not long survive; and several times during his last visit, in the end of February, 1824, he thought she was in the act of expiring."

Doctor James W. Roach "had several times during six years seen her, always found her sick, several times extremely ill. Had reasons to believe she never would recover."

Jane Mary Andrews "frequently visited, attended on, and sat up with Mrs. Mattingly." "Saw her frequently faint and at the point of death." "In fact her case was considered as entirely hopeless. Her disease continued with increasing severity to the 9th of March, 1824."

Reverend Anthony Kohlmann, "on the 9th of March, 1824, paid a visit to Mrs. Mattingly, late in the evening, and found her as low as he had ever seen her; that to him she had all the appearance of a dying person; that her voice was so weak that he had to apply his ear to her lips to distinguish her words; that she told him she could scarcely see or hear." "Her frame was the wreck of sickness and corruption."

Reverend S. L. Dubuisson—"During the course of the novena, (from the 1st to the 9th of March, 1824) Mrs. Mattingly was desperately ill. He saw her on the 29th of February, and on the 7th and 9th of March, always confined to bed, and frequently in those fits of coughing and vomiting of blood, which looked very much like her last struggles with death. When he left her, about half past ten o'clock at night, she was worse than ever."

Reverend William Matthews—"On the 9th of March, 1824, he visited her at night." "He left her at about half past ten o'clock, apparently in the jaws of death."

Thus, Most Reverend sir, it is incontestably established, that at about half-past ten o'clock, on the night of the 9th of March, this good lady was in the most debilitated situation that any living human being could be found, sinking under the torture and exhaustion of a disease, which during upwards of six years had been ravaging her constitution and was pronounced by all who saw her, whether physicians or

not, to be incurable. She had every symptom of death upon her; and if it was physically possible to remove her disease and heal that frame, so properly described as "the wreck of sickness and corruption," it would be in contravention of every law of nature that she could for a long time, if ever, gather that strength which would enable her to go through the exhausting labour which she underwent ere the lapse of twenty hours from this period. How many days of care, rest, nursing and sustenance cautiously administered, are required for the convalescent from an ordinary fever? What would be the fate of him, who, the instant that his pulse has resumed its natural beat, should rise from his bed and mix in the bustle of ordinary life?

My assertion then is, that if at this moment the disorder of Mrs. Mattingly had been removed miraculously or naturally, I care not which, she was in such a state of debility, that the mere removal of the disease would not be alone sufficient to enable her for some months, to resume the ordinary occupations of active life, but that for such a purpose a miraculous bestowal of strength would be farther required.

Let us, however, pursue the evidence, and we shall see that she was not restored at this hour. The persons who spent the night in her room together with herself, can now be our only witnesses.

Mrs. Sybilla Carbery, "at about eleven o'clock on this night, in answer to a question put to Mrs. Mattingly of how she then felt, she replied, 'I am almost gone. If I die, aunt Carbery, will you love my children and pray for me?' and that in so weak a voice, as to seem almost extinct, which compelled this deponent to put her ear close to Mrs. Mattingly's lips, to distinguish what she said, and that at a little after two o'clock on the morning of the 10th, when this deponent again asked her the same question as mentioned above, she answered in the same low voice, 'almost gone.' "

Her sisters, Ruth and Catherine Carbery, remained with her that night, and testify, "all the symptoms of her case appearing to indicate that her death was fast approaching, and that up to the very moment before her sudden restoration to perfect health, these symptoms seemed more and more alarming." They also unite with Sybilla Carbery, Anne Maria Fitzgerald, and Mary Susan Mattingly, the daughter of Mrs. Mattingly, in testifying, that "she was so weak and low, that she appeared to spit with great pain and difficulty, and very little at a time." Those ladies have given me a particular description of the difficulty which they found towards four o'clock on that morning, in disengaging a small quantity of clotted blood from the patient's throat, so as to enable her to breathe. I have found on this as on several other

occasions, how much more satisfactory and distinct the testimony is which one derives from *viva voce* examination, than from any written documents. I shall never forget the description to me of the occurrences of that morning!

Miss Fitzgerald testifies to "the dry and parched state of her mouth," at the very time of her receiving the communion, at a little after four o'clock, on the morning of the 10th, and "the delay occasioned by her violent fit of coughing."

Reverend S. L. Dubuisson himself, who arrived at about four o'clock on the morning of the 10th of March, states, "On my arrival, she was in the same state of extreme weakness and suffering (see what he says, page 14, of the state in which he left her about five or six hour before) a paroxysm of her cough which came on, made me almost apprehensive lest she might be prevented from receiving the communion, but it proved of short duration." "She would help to fix it (a towel), but finds herself unable to raise her arm."

Thus, the evidence of her sickness, prostration and worst symptoms, is brought to the moment of her receiving the holy communion, at a little after four o'clock, on the morning of the 10th of March, 1824.

Let us now turn to her own account. She states, in the supplement to No. 1, "Such in fact was my exhausted and debilitated state, that it was with great difficulty I could spit at all during that night, and what I did spit was in smaller quantities than usual." "The lump on my side was so inflamed and so painful, that I could not suffer my arm to touch it; and the sinews of my arm being contracted, I could not keep it entirely from touching my side. In this distressing situation, I calmly and without agitation of mind, awaited the final close of my earthly misery." In the affidavit she states, "the holy Eucharist was administered to her by the Reverend Mr. Dubuisson, at a little after four o'clock on the morning of Wednesday, the 10th of March, 1824;" "the pain and sickness, at the moment after receiving, were, if possible, greater than at any former time, and so intense as to threaten her immediate dissolution." "Finally she declares at the moment of receiving the blessed sacrament, she felt so extremely ill, that believing the time arrived when she must either die, or, through the mercy and goodness of God, be restored to health, she made this mental prayer or aspiration; 'Lord Jesus! thy holy will be done.'" "That in consequence of the hard and dry state of her tongue, at the time of her receiving the blessed sacrament, five or six minutes elapsed before she was able to swallow it."

Miss Anne Maria Fitzgerald testifies: "I saw him put the blessed

sacrament on her tongue; in consequence of the dry and parched state of her tongue and mouth, she appeared to have some difficulty in swallowing it."

Thus up to the instant of her swallowing the holy sacrament of the Eucharist. all the symptoms have continuedly a fatal appearance. A few minutes elapsed between her receiving the sacrament on her tongue and her swallowing it, and during these minutes no change takes place.

Mrs. Mattingly informs us, "directly having done so (swallowed the sacrament), she found she was relieved from all pain and sickness." "She immediately found herself able to rise from her bed without any assistance, and in presence of Mr. Dubuisson, and her relatives and attending friends, kneel in thanksgiving to Almighty God." "when suddenly in the twinkling of an eye, all pain left me, my body was entirely healed, and I found myself in perfect health."

Ruth Carbery and Catherine Carbery state, "that they were present on the morning of the 10th of March, 1824, when Mrs. Mattingly, their sister, received the blessed sacrament from the hands of the Reverend Mr. Dubuisson; and that in a few minutes afterwards, a little after four o'clock, they beheld her arising in her bed—putting on her stockings, which they believe she had not done for some time before—leaving her bed and falling on her knees before the adorable sacrament." They call it "her sudden restoration to perfect health."

Sybilla Carbery "was present in the chamber of the said Mrs. Mattingly, a little after four o'clock on the morning of the 10th of March, 1824, and saw the Reverend Mr. Dubuisson administer to her the sacrament of the holy Eucharist. That a few minutes after Mrs. Mattingly had received the blessed sacrament, this deponent saw her rise in her bed and heard her exclaim, 'Lord Jesus! what have I done to deserve so much?' or some similar expression; and saw her in a few minutes afterwards arise from her bed, draw on her stockings and fall upon her knees to offer up her thanksgivings to Almighty God." "When Mrs. Mattingly rose from her bed, on the morning of the 10th of March, she appeared to this deponent to be in perfect health, with the exception of her being greatly reduced in flesh, and, although her face was emaciated, her countenance was serene and cheerful. It might be well to give here the description which Captain Carbery gave of her face just previously, "her cheeks flushed with hectic fever—her countenance greatly distorted with pain."

Miss Fitzgerald—"In a few minutes after she had received it (the sacrament), I saw her raise herself in the bed with her hands clasped,

and heard her exclaim in an audible voice: 'Lord Jesus! what have I done to deserve so great a favour?' The Reverend Mr. Dubuisson then asked Mrs. Mattingly how she felt. She replied, 'I am perfectly well.' He then inquired: 'Entirely free from pain?' She replied, 'I am entirely free from pain—no pain at all.' 'Not even there?' said he, pointing to her left side. 'No,' she replied. Her stockings were then brought to her, which she drew on, and got out of bed with apparent ease, and without assistance. She then knelt and continued about a quarter of an hour before the blessed sacrament, which was on an altar which had been prepared for the occasion. About this time, her brother Thomas came into the room; when she arose from her knees, and raised her arms, and said, in a transport of gratitude, 'See what God has done for me! I have not done this for years.' After this, she joined the family in prayer, for a considerable time, without the least apparent inconvenience.''

Mr. Dubussion, after describing his folding up the sacrament, left after giving her communion, which occupies generally three or four minutes, says, ''When behold! Mrs. Mattingly fetches a deep sigh—rises slowly to the sitting position—stretches her arms forwards and exclaims, with a firm, though somewhat weak voice, 'Lord Jesus! what have I done to deserve so great a favour?' The emotion, the affright of the persons in the room, is betrayed by sobs and tears, and half-suppressed shrieks. I rise with a thrill through my whole frame; step to the bedside—she grasps my hand—'Ghostly father,' she cries out, 'what can I do to acknowledge such a blessing?' My first, my spontaneous expressions are, 'Glory be to God! We may say so! Oh! what a day for us!' I then bid her say what she felt. 'Not the least pain felt.' 'None there?' said I, pointing to her breast. 'Not the least—only some weakness.' I ask her how she has come to be relieved. She had felt as if she were dying from excess of pain—had offered up a short prayer of the heart to Jesus Christ—and instantly found herself freed from all sufferings whatever.

'' 'I wish to get up,' she exclaims, 'and give thanks to God on my knees.' 'But,' I replied, 'can you?' 'I can, if you will give me leave.' Her sisters immediately look for her stockings (she used to lie in bed nearly dressed,) but upon my observing that our very first occupation should be to give thanks, we kneel down—she remains sitting in her bed—and all recite three times, the Lord's Prayer, with the Hail Mary, and Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as also the short ejaculatory prayer, Lord Jesus, may thy name be glorified. She joins with continued firmness of voice, (I then looked at my

watch: it was twenty-two minutes after four. I accordingly estimated that the cure had been effected at about fifteen minutes after four.) Directly after, her stockings are brought; she is surrounded by her friends; gets up and walks, unassisted, and with steady deportment, to the table, dressed in the shape of an altar, on which the blessed Eucharist lay, there bends her knees, and remains for a while lost in an act of adoration."

We have now the testimony of Mrs. Mattingly, Reverend S. L. Dubuisson, Mrs. Sybilla Carbery, Miss Ruth Carbery, Miss Catherine Carbery, and Miss Mary Anne Fitzgerald, who were all present, to show us the suddenness and perfection of the restoration. Here are six good witnesses; but mark, Most Reverend sir, the circumstances under which the testimony is given. They had frequent, and long, and painful opportunities, in common with many others, of previously knowing the dreadful state of the subject of this restoration; her description of her own feelings agrees perfectly with their account of her symptoms, whether of illness or of health, and we shall see that other witnesses now soon crowd in so as to put it out of their power to combine successfully in pretending that there was such a recovery, when in truth there was not. There is in addition to this the testimony of a young lady whom I saw at Captain Carbery's in last September, who, though present, sought as much as possible to avoid coming forward; this is Miss Mary Susan Mattingly, the daughter of the lady who was restored, and who unites with the other ladies above named in the affidavit in calling it a sudden restoration to health, and states that she "was present at, and witnessed her wonderful cure."

I now come to take a new view of the evidence, and to prove by the subsequent witnesses that she must have been cured at that time, and that the restoration was perfect and sudden, and not gradual and in the natural manner. Mr. Dubuisson well says that his impressions could not be more profound "had he seen Mrs. Mattingly dead and raised to life again;" her action "and tone of voice denoted soundness of mind as well as of body;" "something in her look and features, which he shall not undertake to depict, an expression of firmness, and of earnest, awful feelings, the recollection of which it will be his consolation to preserve through life."[3]

Mr. Dubuisson left Mrs. Mattingly about ten minutes after her

[3] An allusion was here made to some private disclosure of the patient to the Right Reverend author; but, as it is necessarily impossible to explain this in such a way as to throw any light on the narrative, it has been thought expedient to suppress it.

cure. Mr. Matthews says that Mr. Dubuisson immediately hurried back to inform him that Mrs. Mattingly was instantaneously restored to perfect health after receiving the sacrament. It is likely that the news was quickly spread abroad, for many persons told me that they heard it before six o'clock in the morning. Mr. Kohlmann states, that he said mass in the chapel at Georgetown, at half after three in the morning, and in an hour or two afterwards, learned that Mrs. Mattingly had been suddenly cured at fifteen minutes past four o'clock. You are well acquainted with the site of Captain Carbery's house, where the restoration took place. It is near the residence of General Van Ness, about a furlong southwest of the President's House. Mr. Matthews' is at St. Patrick's Church, in F. street, about the same distance east of the public offices; you are also aware that the College of Georgetown is about two miles in an opposite range from Captain Carbery's, and spreading in both these directions, the news was quickly disseminated, and was of such a nature as to excite a reasonable curiosity. Miss Fitzgerald informs us, that while she was first at prayer and probably whilst Mr. Dubuisson was in the room, "her brother Thomas, in whose house she resided, came into the room; when she arose from her knees and raised her arms, and said in a transport of gratitude, 'See what God has done for me; I have not done this for years.' After this she joined the family in prayer, and for a considerable time, without the least apparent inconvenience." Her brother Thomas now describes her symptoms—"In a few minutes after her restoration he felt her pulse, and it was regular and healthful—for the first time in six years, her spittle was white and like that of a healthy person—the lump on her side was gone, and in fact, to all appearance, there was not the slightest vestige of disease left." "All this complicated machinery of the human system, so much deranged and out of order, beyond the reach of medicine and of medical skill, was, in a twinkling of an eye, restored to the most regular and healthful action." "On the morning of her recovery, she ate a hearty breakfast." I found upon inquiry, that she breakfasted before seven o'clock that morning, after a good deal of exercise in going to various parts of the rooms, and opening and examining drawers, some of which were very heavy.

She stated herself, "that from the moment of her restoration her appetite has been perfectly good, and while (on the 24th of March, 1824) she is rapidly regaining her natural strength and flesh, no symptom of disease, or the slightest indisposition of any kind has been felt by her, and that in place of the former disagreeable taste in her mouth, she has constantly had a sweet taste nearly resembling that of loaf sugar."

Her sisters depose "that she ate several times that morning, (the 10th of March,) and has continued to show as good an appetite as other persons in perfect health."

The number of persons who, in the interval, learned the event, now began quickly to pour in, and her brother Thomas informs us, "her bodily strength has been put to the severest test, in receiving many hundred visitants, drawn to his house by this signal and wonderful work of God." Hence, at an early hour on the same day, the fact of her perfect and sudden restoration became more notorious in the federal city than that of her hopeless and death-like condition had been on the previous night.

I shall now, sir, bring into view the subject matter of the affidavits which I procured in last November. They contain the direct and circumstantial testimony of herself, both her sisters, and her aunt, to prove that her loins, back, and shoulders were in a state of high and painful ulceration, previous to and on the night of the 9th of March, and up to the moment of her restoration on the morning of the 10th. The very state in which she lay would, independently of any direct testimony of the fact, show that such naturally ought to have been the case. Her affidavit stated, that having swallowed the sacrament, "she found that she was relieved from all pain and sickness." The supplement to No. 1 states, "In the twinkling of an eye, all pain left me—my body was entirely healed." These expressions would cover the entire case; but as my inquiries were, for the reason originally stated, drawn particularly to this as an extremely strong feature of the event, I prefer having special reference to the testimony which bears directly upon it.

Her own description is distinct, vivid, and natural. "The skin having been broken through in several places, and ulcers having been formed," the sensation she felt was generally like "that of severe burning." She describes the dressing of these sores, and their adhesion, the pain she underwent in the change of her inside clothing, especially the great soreness and the dressings within the week previous to her restoration, and her sensation of that soreness and of the adhesion just previous to the restoration itself, and her submission to that pain rather than undergo the torture of a new dressing at a moment when she calmly awaited death as a delivery from her sufferings.

Her sister Ruth testifies to her having, during a long period, complained of the sore and ulcerated state of her back, her frequently preparing and giving the soothing preparation to be applied thereto, and receiving that which had been removed, and which too distinctly bore testimony to the high state of the ulceration. She testifies to the clothing

both of the body and of the bed evincing the same, "that she has often seen the shoulders of her sister highly inflamed, having running sores," and this continued up to the 10th of March.

Her sister Catherine, testifies the complaint of the patient of the soreness of the back and shoulders; her frequent assistance in giving the lenitive preparation to be applied thereto, and her receiving what had been removed therefrom, all bearing distinct evidence of the existence of the ulcer. She also testifies to her sister's complaining of the adhesion of the clothing to the sore, and the evidence of the truth of this complaint in the appearance of the clothing itself, and that this continued up to the 10th of March.

Her aunt, Sybilla Carbery, testifies to the patient's complaint of the soreness and serious ulceration of her back, and to her having frequently seen the lenitive prepared for the purpose of being applied; and the general conviction in the family that on the morning of the 10th of March it was in as sore and ulcerated a condition as it had been at any previous time.

I would here remark, that, upon inquiry, I found that Mrs. Mattingly, upon some occasions, would permit only her sisters to assist in what she considered the more painful, unpleasant, or delicate duties about her person; that, generally, perhaps always, as Mr. Dubuisson testifies, "she used to lie in bed nearly dressed;" and hence even Mrs. Sybilla Carbery was not employed in administering the lenitive preparation for those ulcers, nor in receiving what had been removed. Moreover, the same feeling of extreme delicacy gave no opportunity even to her sisters, of seeing the more ulcerated portion of the body—and one of them, Catherine, though under the impression that she must have seen the shoulders in their state of ulceration, could not bring it so distinctly as she could wish to her recollection. Being myself fully convinced by the testimony of Mrs. Mattingly, and from the plain nature of the case, I was not anxious to inquire what other testimony could be adduced for this part of the case; but I was informed by several respectable persons, in Washington, that, immediately on the promulgation of the fact of restoration, this circumstance was as generally known as any other—though the excitement which the whole case produced, and its palpable evidence, caused minds to contemplate the whole case, rather than to come to the consideration of particulars. It is thus fully in evidence, that, at the moment of her receiving the holy Eucharist, her shoulders and loins were in a state of great ulceration, with the clothing painfully adhering to the ulcers.

There are many other particulars relative to the state of the bed

and clothing, which I have learned in conversation with Mrs. Mattingly and her sisters,—quite analogous to a fact which will be developed in the examination of Mrs. Mattingly's affidavit, that might, with propriety, be introduced here; but they are not stated in the sworn documents, and I did not myself fully comprehend their full force and bearing, until I had a conversation upon the subject with one of those ladies, after the affidavits had been completed. However, their exhibition would not convince the persons who will resist the evidence which I publish and examine. I shall, therefore, confine myself strictly to what is testified upon oath, by witnesses not only unimpeached, but confessedly unimpeachable, and regarding plain and obvious facts, in which there could have been no delusion.

I now proceed to show that the back and shoulders were also instantly healed, as soon as she had swallowed the sacrament.

In the first place, I refer to the expressions of her original affidavit, "that she was at that instant 'directly relieved from all that pain and sickness, which, at the moment of receiving, was, if possible, greater than at any other time, and so intense as to threaten her immediate dissolution." In the supplement she swears, "when suddenly, in the twinkling of an eye, all pain left me, my body was entirely healed, and I found myself in perfect health." She states, "On the morning of her said restoration, and just previous thereto, she felt the clothing of her back adhering to the ulcers of the back, so as to be extremely painful, and it would have been a serious relief to her to have them dressed,—but her state of exhaustion and weariness was such, that she preferred suffering the pain of the undressed sore, than submit to, or make the exertion of dressing it." It is then clear, that a great portion of her pain arose from those ulcers, and that they were not dressed, and that she was directly relieved from all pain, and, of course, from the pain of the ulcers. But not only does she swear that all pain left her, but that her body was entirely healed,—which would not be true if the ulcers were not healed. In the affidavit she distinctly refers to the expression, "instantaneously and perfectly freed from all pains and sickness at about four o'clock in the morning," to the previous statement of the ulcerated state of her back as given above.

Mrs. Sybilla Carbery swears, that "when Mrs. Mattingly arose from her bed on the morning of the 10th, she appeared to be in perfect health, with the exception of being greatly reduced in flesh." Were she then suffering under a greatly ulcerated back, it would be another very serious exception.

Miss A. M. Fitzgerald testifies Mrs. Mattingly's declaration to Mr.

Dubuisson immediately, "I am entirely free from pain—no pain at all,"—a declaration altogether incompatible with the continuance of the ulceration, but fully in accordance with her own statements, and with the testimony of Mr. Dubuisson himself. "Not the least pain left." "None there?" said I, pointing to the breast. "Not the least—only some weakness." "Instantly had found herself freed from all sufferings whatever."

I might well rest the case here, and merely add the notorious fact that, from that moment forward, she has never found the least soreness or tenderness in the parts which had been thus ulcerated. I might also advert to the impossibility of a lady with an ulcerated back performing what we shall observe her doing on that same day, and feel that my position was firmly sustained by her own direct testimony, and the corroboration which is thus given. I shall, however, advert to more special evidence. We can well and easily conceive the sensations excited in this family. Mr. Dubuisson states his own, and he was not singular,—for the principle of our nature is in every individual the same. Peculiar circumstances will develop or restrain it, but its foundation and nature is in all human beings the same. Her family looked upon her this morning with wonder and with awe. They beheld in her a most extraordinary instance of the merciful and miraculous interference of Him, who gave laws to nature, and can suspend or contravene those laws at his will. Occasionally they hesitated to approach her. They doubted the testimony of their senses. They doubted the accuracy of their recollections. They saw now the most active, the most sprightly, the most healthful amongst them, that very being whose dissolution they had so long considered as immediately inevitable,—whom they viewed as one summoned by an irreversible decree to the world of spirits,—and now they could scarcely imagine her mortal. Their expressions to me were, that she seemed to them as the inhabitant of another world, who had suddenly made her appearance on this earth. No wonder that, under such circumstances, there should be delayed all that critical examination which a philosopher would, in his abstraction from ordinary life and extraordinary circumstances, require! Yet, after all, the best testimony of fact is that which is given by nature surrounded with her own circumstances. The mind is not prepared, in such a case as this, with all the novelty, the freshness, the astonishment, and the awe of such a scene, to enter into a close and critical examination at the instant. Some succession of occasions suggests the succession of inquiries, until that which is effected in a moment, becomes developed in detail. So it is in the ordinary events of life, in the usual occurrences of nature.

If, by sudden assault, a city is laid waste, the events of an hour are only developed by the examination of days; the sudden devastations of the whirlwind are only discovered and enumerated after the terror of the scene will have passed away; weeks will have elapsed, and the mind, already informed of extensive details, expects to learn more. The effects produced in a moment, are not always discovered at the very instant they occur.

Not only was this family agitated in the manner which I have attempted to describe,—but the lady herself, placed in a new and unexpected situation, had new and unexpected wants, which, after the first moments given to prayer and congratulation, obtruded themselves upon her. I state here the result of my inquiries in the family. Mrs. Mattingly had been so long confined to bed, and there was so little expectation of her recovery, that, amongest other circumstances, her wardrobe was altogether neglected. She lay in a bed-dress, and in that costume she had risen, merely adding stockings and such slippers as could first be found. Almost immediately, inquiries were made, and visitors were evidently to be expected. She herself commenced a search and an arrangement of her drawers to procure some clothing better suited to the circumstances, than the apparel she wore. Breakfast was served; her appetite, fully established, was pressing, and it was satisfied; the arrangement of her wardrobe was resumed; and a little tired by this very unusual exertion, she flung herself into a low chair with a hard back; and with that flow of spirits for which she was remarkable some years before, she was making a cheerful observation to her aunt, and as she made it, leaned back upon the chair. Then, for the first time, at about seven o'clock on the morning of her restoration, her aunt adverted to the state of her ulcerated back. But, with the consciousness that her body was entirely healed at the moment of her restoration, and also from her subsequent experience, she immediately answered, "No, Aunt Carbery, it is perfectly well." She then retired, for the purpose of changing her dress, and also to satisfy a very natural curiosity, by examining her back. Her own oath satisfies us, that so far as it was possible for her to examine and observe, she found her entire back and shoulders perfectly whole and sound, and free from any pain or tenderness, or appearance of ulcer, or of a healed sore, but the skin altogether continued, unbroken, and as if it never had been sore."

Her sister, Ruth Carbery, swears, that Mrs. Mattingly "continually declared that her back and shoulders were then instantly healed," that is, on the 10th of March.

Catherine Carbery, from the account which she gave me, must, I am

convinced, have been present at what she describes as having either occurred in her presence, or as having been immediately communicated to her. In the one case, she would be a witness to the whole transaction; in the second supposition, she would corroborate the direct testimony of others, by her evidence, as to the general sentiment, at the moment, in the family, "that, after examining herself, her sister returned, declaring that her back was perfectly healed, and that the skin upon the place which had been sore, was as smooth as was that upon the back of her hand."

Mrs. Sybilla Carbery relates the whole transaction, adding, that the skin upon the back of Mrs. Mattingly's hand, to which she compared that upon her back and shoulders, "was whole, entire and sound."

I trust, then, Most Reverend sir, that it will appear fully evident, that the ulcerated back and shoulders were instantly healed, as soon as she had swallowed the holy Eucharist.

I shall now briefly advert to one other fact, the truth of which, so far as documents or oaths go, must rest upon Mrs. Mattingly's own sole testimony. The entire of that testimony is contained in the document. She there informs us, that just before the restoration, "she felt the clothing of her back adhering to the ulcers of the back, so as to be extremely painful." And she tells us, that, upon the examination which she made after the remark of her aunt, she found "her clothing perfectly free from any appearance of having adhered to an ulcer, though she was perfectly and painfully conscious thereof within the space of four hours before this examination." "She had not previously changed her inside clothing which she wore during the night." But I would neither do justice to my own convictions, nor to the case, unless I added to this my assurance, that, after the conversations I have had with Mrs. Mattingly and other members of her family, I am perfectly convinced that, were I disposed to collect and to publish the testimony in relation thereto, it would appear to the satisfaction of every unbiassed, impartial, and judicious reader, unquestionable, that as miraculous a change took place in the state of the clothing of the bed and of the body, as there did in the state of the body itself.

I have now, Most Reverend sir, closed my examination of the direct testimony immediately bearing upon the miracle itself. The witnesses, who now come in crowds, will merely show it consequentially; for they all find her in that state which cannot be accounted for upon any other ground than of a sudden restoration. I shall not, therefore, do more than enumerate a few of the principal persons, and make a general reference to their affidavits, or certificates.

Reverend Mr. Matthews, who had seen her "at about half past ten o'clock, on the night of the 9th, apparently in the jaws of death," informs us, that having been informed by Mr. Dubuisson, who hurried back for the purpose, that "she was instantaneously restored to perfect health, after receiving the blessed sacrament," "he went down to Captain Carbery's, to view the astonishing event. When he arrived, Mrs. Mattingly opened the door! and with a smiling countenance shook his hand. Although prepared for this meeting, he could not suppress his astonishment at the striking contrast produced in her person in a few hours. His mind had for years associated death and her pale and emaciated face. A thrilling awe pervaded his whole frame." I do not know whether this be the same interview which Reverend Mr. Dubuisson describes, but I suppose it is. Though I conversed with the Reverend Mr. Matthews upon the subject, fully and closely, my memory does not serve me accurately here; but I am under the impression that it was probably near ten o'clock before this interview took place, and that nearly eleven hours had elapsed between his two visits. Mr. Dubuisson states that he left Washington in the stage, which departed for Baltimore at eleven o'clock; and just before his setting out, "he went down, in company with the Reverend Mr. Matthews, to see Mrs. Mattingly again. She came and met us at the door, knelt down to receive her pastor's (Mr. Matthews's) blessing; in short, looked and acted as one perfectly restored to health, who has only more strength and flesh to recover." Hence, though this was at most but six hours after her restoration, she was now able to go to the door to receive her visiters in perfect health, and not in gradual convalescence.

Reverend Anthony Kohlmann informs us, that at about five or six o'clock in the morning of the 10th, "he learned that Mrs. Mattingly had been suddenly cured at fifteen minutes after four; and about nine o'clock, on the same morning, he with his own eyes beheld her restored to that health of which it was so universally believed she was bereft for ever." "Her sudden recovery fell hardly short of a resurrection from the dead; nothing, indeed, but divine omnipotence being capable of reorganizing, with a perfect state of health, such a frame as hers was, the wreck of sickness and corruption." He had seen her about ten hours before, having "all the appearance of a dying person."

There was no concealment of the lady; no backwardness to admit visiters; no caution to avoid breaking the repose of a convalescent. Mrs. Christiana Hobbs swears, that on the 10th of March, "at about eight o'clock in the morning, she received a letter from Captain Thomas Car-

bery, conveying the pleasing intelligence, that at a quarter after four o'clock, Mrs. Mattingly left her bed in the most perfect health."

Mrs. Mary Jane Andrews swears, that "understanding on the morning of the 10th, that she (Mrs. Mattingly) had been suddenly and in a most extraordinary manner restored to perfect health, she visited her, and found her to all appearance perfectly well, walking about the room, and cheerfully conversing with her numerous friends, and other persons, who had resorted to the house to see her after her wonderful cure."

Mrs. Eliza Cassin "went on the morning of the 10th, at about ten o'clock, to Captain Carbery's, in the expectation of finding Mrs. Mattingly dead or dying; but on arriving at the house, to her great astonishment and wonder, she was told that Mrs. Mattingly was well, and on entering her chamber, found her on the bed. She shook Mrs. Cassin by the hand. Before Mrs. Cassin left the house, she saw Mrs. Mattingly get up and meet the clergyman at the door; and except in her loss of flesh, had, to this deponent, the appearance of being in sound health, and in possession of a fine flow of spirits.

Miss Eliza Miller, Miss Harriet Miller, and Miss Louisa H. Berryman swear "what they felt on the morning of the 10th of March, upon receiving the news that she (Mrs. Mattingly) was perfectly well, and themselves seeing her at about ten o'clock, actually in good health, they cannot describe." They left her late on the previous evening, "under the impression that she was in a dying condition."

Mr. George Sweeny, then principal clerk in the post-office, swears that, "having heard on Wednesday morning, the 10th of March, that Mrs. Mattingly had been suddenly restored to perfect health, he visited her, in company with Mr. Nathan Smith, of Washington, at about nine o'clock, A. M., and that upon his entering her chamber, she arose from the bed on which she was sitting, walked briskly across the floor to meet him, and shook him heartily by the hand."

Doctor Wm. Jones, the present postmaster, certifies that, "on Wednesday, the 10th of March, by the personal request of Captain Carbery, who assured him that his patient was cured, he called, and to his great surprise and gratification, she met him at her chamber door, in apparent health." I have not conversed with Doctor Jones upon the subject, as I was informed that he did not wish to be examined upon the case, and that he expressed some regret at having given even that sort of certificate which has been used. I have known similar instances of reluctance; and the ground which has been more than once alleged, was stated to be the apprehension that certificates used for such purposes would not ingratiate the physician who gave them to the Protestant

families in which he was employed. In making these remarks, I do not intend to convey any unkind or unpleasant imputation against Doctor Jones, but to assign the reason for my not having conversed with him when on the spot and engaged in the investigation. The certificate is, of course, perfectly true, and the restoration to health has been proved by a test of six years to be a reality; besides, on the 30th of the same month, after a lapse of twenty days, the doctor assures us that "he saw Mrs. Mattingly to-day, and is happy to have it in his power to say that she continues well." A prudent witness, like Doctor Jones, is certainly preferable to one who would be over zealous.

Mrs. Mary H. Fitzgerald "heard she was restored to health; when, on the same day, (the 10th of March,) she paid her a visit, and, to her great astonishment and satisfaction, she found her in apparent good health, perfectly cheerful, and conversing with her numerous friends."

Mr. James Carbery, "on Wednesday, the 10th of March, about noon, was with her. She was then free from pain, experiencing no uneasy sensation in her side, stomach, or arm; the voice and countenance restored to their natural tone and expression; all was placed in perfect health. Emaciation and weakness alone remained; still she was strong enough to walk about the room and converse with a great number of persons, without any apparent inconvenience to herself." She declared to him, "that God had instantaneously restored her to health at a quarter after four o'clock that morning."

Justice Wharton, "on Wednesday evening, the 10th of March, found her well; visited her every day from the 10th to the 15th, (affidavit sworn to on the 16th,) and has found her quite well, walking about the house, and giving the most undeniable proof of her perfect, and, as he believes, miraculous restoration to health."

Alderman Hoban said that, "at an early hour on the 10th of March, he was informed that Mrs. Mattingly was suddenly restored to health; that he called to see her the evening of the same day, and on entering her chamber, she took him by the hand, meeting him with a cheerful countenance, and assured him that she was in perfect health."

Dr. Thomas C. Scott, still residing in Washington, with whom I repeatedly conversed on this case, states that, "it being announced on Wednesday morning, the 10th of March, that Mrs. Mattingly had been suddenly restored to health, he visited her that evening, in company with several gentlemen. On entering her room, he was struck with surprise to find her standing, engaged in a lively and cheerful conversation with several persons who had preceded him, evincing a system tranquil and harmonious in its operations, free from disease or suffer-

ing. The ravages of her sufferings were strongly marked by very considerable emaciation and a very pale countenance." "Notwithstanding she had been engaged in conversation from early in the morning to the hour of my visit, about eight o'clock, in detailing the history of her cure, she was perfectly free from the slightest cough, and in the free exercise of that arm which had been wholly useless, from the great pain attending its use. Mrs. Mattingly assured him that she felt as well as ever she did; and as far as an opinion could be formed from her appearance, he considered her in perfect health, without a vestige of disease, except what he had previously mentioned."

Catherine N. Cleary swears that, "she saw her on the 10th of March when her cough and every symptom of disease had left her." But surely I need go no further. We have here, including the lady herself, seven witnesses who give direct evidence of the fact of sudden restoration; her brother, the mayor, who is a witness to the state of perfect health in a few minutes after the occurrence; we have testimony from several witnesses that the fact was proclaimed abroad, early that morning, in the federal city and district; and sixteen other witnesses. who themselves saw and conversed with her, whom she took by the hand, to and with whom she walked, in the midst of whom she stood, and they accompanied by numbers of others. I was told by her and by the family, that through the entire day, from an early hour in the morning until nine o'clock that evening, the house was thronged with visiters; and all who chose to come were indiscriminately admitted. Thus, at an early hour in the morning, and during that day, there was notorious evidence that Mrs. Mattingly was in that situation which inevitably leads us to conclude that the testimony of the direct witnesses to the sudden restoration must necessarily be true. It is the only way in which we can account for the cheerful, active, and healthy state in which she is found by those witnesses, and by the persons who, besides them, successively thronged to the mayor's residence, to see his suddenly restored sister.

Mr. Lewis Carbery finds her in perfect health, at nine o'clock, on Thursday morning, the 11th. Mrs. Baker testifies that when, on Friday the 12th, returning from the country, she visited Mrs. Mattingly, she found her in perfect health. Miss Booth, on the same day, finds her without any cough, and the use of the left arm perfectly restored.

Doctor Causin who, on the 10th, was informed by many persons that Mrs. Mattingly had on that day been suddenly restored to health, visited her on the invitation of Doctor Jones, about noon, on Saturday, the 13th. She appeared exceedingly cheerful, and remarked, she never

felt better. Her person was reduced, but her countenance was sprightly, indicating ease and harmony throughout the system. She threw the left arm into a variety of attitudes, seemingly with as much ease as the other.

Captain Carbery tells us that "her bodily strength has been put to the severest test in receiving many hundred visitants, drawn to his house by this signal and wonderful work of God."

Reverend Mr. Dubuisson, on the 17th of March, states, "she is daily acquiring strength, as is witnessed, I may say, by the whole city, which flocks to Captain Carbery's house in order to see her."

Her sisters, Ruth Carbery and Catherine Carbery, swear, of the 10th of March, "that on that same day, hundreds came to see her, with most of whom she shook hands and conversed, with manifest ease and satisfaction."

This, Most Reverend sir, is, I believe, as perfect and sufficient a body of evidence as could be required by anything short of absolute scepticism, to establish unquestionably the fact, that from the earliest hour on the morning of Wednesday, the 10th of March, 1824, Mrs. Mattingly was in such a state of health, activity, and cheerfulness, as must remove all doubt of the absence of that disease under which she had languished during six years previously, and under the influence of which she appeared to be dying during the preceding night. Let us then add to this, the positive and direct testimony of those witnesses who inform us that the restoration took place a little after four o'clock that morning, and that it was sudden—does not the whole relation cohere admirably? or is it possible for the mind to refuse its assent to the plain truth of the entire statement?

If we had no evidence of her previous illness, strong as the testimony of eight credible persons including herself, of the highest character for integrity might be, who would testify that during that night she was desperately ill, and was towards morning suddenly restored, we might doubt the miraculous nature of the restoration. We may suppose that some sudden and extraordinary cause produced dangerous symptoms, which their terror had exaggerated, and their hyperbolic expressions, so natural on such occasions, had painted in colours far too vivid and glaring; and that without intending to deceive us, they were themselves under the influence of such excitement as to render them inaccurate and unsafe witnesses. We may also reasonably suppose that a cause which so suddenly supervened, was as suddenly removed, and the attack having been only very recent and of very short duration, the patient, though for the time greatly prostrated, was not

seriously impaired in strength, and having been relieved, was, after the lapse of two or three hours, greatly refreshed, and felt not only a return of strength, but also a glow of cheerfulness and an excitement of spirits. But surely this cannot apply in any manner to our case. Here we have a wasting sickness of several years; we have the most distressing and palpable symptoms of disgusting decay; we have ravages of an unusual character, producing the most appalling effects, observed with almost every sense, by numerous witnesses during a series of years; eminent physicians proclaiming that death must be the inevitable consequence, as by every law of nature, it necessarily should; anxious relatives and assiduous friends, day after day, week after week, and month after month, expecting the moment of her dissolution; prudent clergymen daily accustomed to behold the symptoms of approaching death, in every shape, during a long portion of their lives, administering the last aids of religion, and departing under the impression that they and their penitent will not meet again, except before the throne of the eternal God. Here are opportunities which not only give facilities for accurate observation, and produce deep reflection, but which compelled the witnesses to the closest scrutiny, and kept the mind long and frequently engaged in the examination of the case. Novelty, surprise, confusion, haste, had for years ceased to exist; it was a long, familiar scene, to which calm and patient attention had, during a considerable period of time, habituated those by whom Mrs. Mattingly was surrounded or visited; for which and its natural results, every preparation that was necessary or becoming, had long been made. Never were witnesses better circumstanced to preclude the possibility of mistake. The lump, the pain, the fainting, the blood, the matter, the effluvia, the soreness, the plaisters, the state of the clothing, the difficulty and occasional inability to speak, the appearance of the tongue, the rejection of her sustenance, the distortion of her countenance—these and more than these, were too obvious, too frequently observed, seen by too many witnesses, and of too protracted a continuance to have been subjects of mistake. The persons who remained with her during the night of the 9th, and the morning of the 10th, in testifying the continuance of these symptoms to a particular moment, testify to us nothing more than what we know must have occurred; for it is plain, that being in existence they must necessarily have continued up to some moment when they disappeared. It is manifest that they did not exist on the next day, that is, on the 10th of March, nor did any one of them. The only question is, at what hour of the night they disappeared.

Had it been proclaimed on that day that this lady had recovered, but that it was thought prudent to keep her in retirement for some time, and that in the course of a fortnight, she was generally seen and found to be then in good health and excellent spirits, and that she and her family, or a few intimate friends declared that she had been instantly restored, though not publicly exhibited; I confess, though upon inquiry I might feel that the evidence gave satisfaction to myself, I would say there existed very questionable ground for my asking the public to give their assent, because the public had been excluded from the means of obtaining the satisfaction to which they were justly entitled—that of easy and early access. Hence, though I have been told of other restorations, both at Georgetown and Emmitsburg, which may probably be quite true, yet I have never even asked what were the circumstances of either case, because there was such a concealment of the evidence, as left me no room to exercise my judgment, and I am not, if I know myself, over ready to give my assent to statements of this kind without more substantial reasons than the conviction of their truth in the minds of persons probably of far greater sanctity than I can aspire to. God forbid that I should ever countenance the unbecoming expressions of one who affected to play the scholar at the expense of the saint, and wrote in derogation of sacred wisdom; yet, sir, I will express the wish that good, and venerable, and zealous persons would more generally act upon the maxim, that faith must have for its foundation proofs to satisfy the understanding. The submission which God requires is reasonable, and, therefore, I would say, that if Mrs. Mattingly had been shut up from public observation, until supposing the early part of the succeeding month, however respectable the testimony of her family and friends might be, still the evidence would not be in any way so satisfactory as it now is. But here this lady is actually accessible to all who choose to call upon her, and they naturally called at an early hour, and continued thenceforward uninterruptedly to call; and thus it is notorious that she was perfectly restored to health, at a very early hour on the morning of the 10th.

I now inquire whether there can be any reasonable doubt of the correctness and accuracy of the eight witnesses who tell us it was instantaneous. I must confess that I am at a loss to know upon what to found that doubt. The restoration is as plain and palpable as possible. But suppose for a moment that they were deluded. Were all those that came in hundreds that day deluded? Was Doctor Jones deluded? Were they with whom she shook hands, with whom she spoke, and in whose presence she walked, stood, used her arm, ate, drank, made her

declarations, were they all deluded? And if they were; when was she restored? Because of the fact of her subsequent and continued good health and activity, there neither was, is, nor can there be a doubt. We have then the positive testimony of a sufficient number of respectable witnesses regarding an obvious fact, the consequences of which are permanent, though the occurrence is transient; and we have this supported by such a mass of preceding and consequent testimony and circumstances, as gives to it the very highest grade of evidence. To reason farther upon its truth, would be to emulate the wisdom of the philosopher who, not satisfied with the evidence of the existence of the sun, by the immediate testimony of all the senses affected by it, and of the concurrence of all men in the similarity of that testimony, joined to the irresistible force of the perception compelling the conclusion, very wisely determined to disbelieve the fact, until he could frame a syllogism which would give more abundant satisfaction. I am not, however, just now disposed to range myself by his side; I shall therefore assume that the evidence is sufficient to prove the sudden and perfect restoration.

I hesitate, Most Reverend sir, whether I should for a moment turn aside to notice an argument which has been got up in this city, as soon as it was known that I drew some attention to the case. The mighty negative pregnant is this, "General Hayne was in Washington when this is said to have occurred. We asked him on the subject, and he told us he knew nothing about it, therefore, it cannot be true." I would answer, that Major Hamilton, who was also in Washington at the time, informed me that he had heard of it, but knew very little more of it than that it was very generally said the lady was very sick and was then well, and had been suddenly restored to health. Thus, I have positive opposed to negative of the same description, and every one will easily determine whether positive knowledge, or absence of information be preferable. I might suffer the apparent difficulty to be thus disposed of: but I wish to go a little further. Few persons respect General Hayne more than I do; and when I venture an opinion on his competency to give testimony in this case, I do it with all possible esteem for an honourable gentleman, in whose regard I have feelings of very great friendship. General Hayne goes to Washington for duties of altogether another description than would occupy me when I happen to be there. Whilst I was engaged in conversing with Mrs. Mattingly, or some of the witnesses in her case, probably my friend, the senator from South Carolina, was delighting the fathers of our Union with his rich and copious eloquence, and his speech might have been the topic of conversation through an entire half of the Union whilst I

remained in total ignorance of the fact that he made such an oration. Could any reasonable man doubt the fact because of my want of information! Those occurrences which are in my estimation of high importance, are perhaps scarcely considered worthy of a thought by the senators of the United States. But I now say, that even at this moment, if the honourable senator will vouchsafe to visit Mrs. Mattingly and converse with her, I will leave it to him to decide upon the truth or falsehood of her sudden restoration, on the 10th of March, 1824. I respect his judgment and integrity so highly, that I shall be satisfied, if he will but investigate. And, indeed, I can scarcely think that it is likely that he heard nothing of the occurrence at the time. I am more inclined to suppose, that if the use which has been made of his name is correct, he did not look upon it as worth recollecting. General Hayne and I might take very different views of the consequences of the fact. Whilst I view them as more important than any subject which it is his duty as a senator to investigate; my honourable friend would probably feel quite astonished at this declaration. You will excuse me for this apparent digression; but it meets the only objection I have heard raised to the occurrence, and the same principle which turned his name to account here, would probably turn other names to the same purpose elsewhere.

I shall conclude this part of my examination, with a short reference to the principal topics laid down by Paley, respecting the evidence of miraculous facts (*Evid, of Christ.* Prop. ii. c. 1.) I select this author, not because I look upon him as equal to some of our own upon the same subject, but because his work is more generally accessible in this country, and is that usually studied in lay colleges in our States.

I. This is even as yet contemporary history. The fact took place in March, 1824, and the documents, with the exception of the last four, were published in the month of May, of the same year. I will here remark, that Archdeacon Paley, in his effort to discredit the miracles of St. Ignatius of Loyola, in this place, is guilty of the most palpable falsehood; but this is not the place to treat of that subject. I only look to his principles.

II. The publication was made in the city of Washington. St. Francis Xavier is also treated in this place with similar injustice to that which his principal had received in the previous case.

III. This is no transient rumour, nor has the story dropped, nor was it permitted to pass without contradiction and controversy. I shall have to examine some of the notable efforts made on the spot immediately, to contradict it's being a miracle. No attempt was made to deny its truth.

IV. It is more than naked history, for it created great interest on the part of some to contradict, and of others to maintain it.

V. There can be nowhere found greater particularities; names, dates, places, circumstances, and the order of events are all given most definitely and accurately, and the persons all well known in our principal city; one of them the mayor of that very city; the subject his sister; the witnesses members of his family, eminent physicians, respectable clergymen, public functionaries, aldermen, justices, ladies of respectability, and so forth.

VI. It required more than an otiose assent, for interests of religion were deeply involved; some persons changed in consequence of believing it; and it did not pass without inquiry and resistance.

VII. Though it was in affirmance of opinions formed by some, it was in contradiction to opinions formed by others; it made converts; "it was a Popish miracle in the midst of Protestants." It was impossible to consider it what is called a "pious fraud," a term which is too often thoughtlessly admitted, or wickedly applied, as if any fraud could be pious, or as if any, under the pretext of piety, were not impious.

Shortly after the publication of the documents in May, 1824, a pamphlet was published and widely circulated, in answer thereto. It was printed in Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, by Mr. James Dunn, and was anonymous. I do not recollect to have seen any other publication professedly in opposition, though there were several essays of various length and [character] in many Protestant periodical publications. This pamphlet, however, contains all that was adduced in opposition, better digested, if I can call "less badly" better, than any of the others. I shall not undertake to review its abuse, ridicule, and sneers, but I shall select all that it contains bearing any resemblance of reasoning.

The writer "undertakes a fair examination of the documents." In his page 5, he states, "On the 10th of March the cure was effected. Instantly it was given out by the priests and ladies in conversation and in letters, by common report and in newspapers, that a wonderful miracle had been wrought, evident to the senses, which none who beheld the astonishing testimony could doubt. Thousands went to view the lady who had so marvellously recovered." "The most industrious efforts were used to propagate the miraculous story to every region of the neighbouring states." This is a full confirmation of the position that there was no concealment. The writer labours to show that the fact which caused all this noise was not worthy thereof, and that all were disappointed at discovering that there was no miracle; a num-

ber of comments upon the Council of Trent, and surmises why the documents were not more speedily published. The writer makes, in his page 8, rather a strange avowal that he had prepared a refutation of the evidence before he saw it.

"For myself, I confess that though the fallacy of the once pretended miracle and the method of refuting its claims were always obvious, I did expect that the promised statement, in the hands of men who, whatever I may have thought of their learning, I supposed at any rate, had some ingenuity, would have been so prepared as at least to have fought a tolerable decent fight. With this expectation, from the beginning of the affair, I have devoted a considerable portion of attention to Catholic miracles, intending whenever the statement should appear, to undertake its exposure. Many sheets were written, a large view of the whole ground of miracles, including a sketch of those so peculiarly ornamental to the Popish history, was taken, and quite a laborious preparation accomplished; but so am I disappointed in the adversary to be contended with—he has fled the ground so entirely: so timid and suppliant is the front he wears, that to use the weapons already forged would seem too much in the vapouring spirit of a Quixote, not to oblige a complete change in my original plan. We need no mountain to crush a moth. But notwithstanding the actual relinquishment of the original ground, I shall still, for reasons which will appear as we proceed, consider the matter as if the object yet were to make us believe in the miraculous character of the cure."

His next ground is, that your venerable predecessor did not believe it to be a miracle; and he attempts to sustain this by forcing a construction on his letter, where, in licensing the publication, he does not use the word miracle. This I shall dismiss with the two remarks—1st, that he asserts what you know not to be the fact, when he asserts "the archbishop's letter is nothing more nor less than a refutation of the whole cause." His letter is the following:

BALTIMORE, April 24, 1824.

To the Rev. Messrs. Matthews and Dubuisson.

"*Reverend and Dear Gentlemen*:—I have read. with considerable attention, the certificates relative both to the long and dangerous sickness of Mrs. A. Mattingly, and to the instantaneous and admirable cure, which she has obtained from the mercy of Almighty God. Such is the number of the witnesses—their well known integrity, candour and intelligence, that their testimonies are certainly entitled to the greatest respect and credibility, about facts, which were obvious to their senses, and which they had frequent opportunities of observing; and as the reading of these certificates may prove to the faithful a motive and occasion of praising the infinite goodness and power of God, and of serving him with increased fervour and fidelity, you have my full approbation to render them public, by means of the press.

"I remain, with respect, reverend and dear gentlemen, your humble servant,

"†AMBROSE MARECHAL, Archbishop of Baltimore."

My second remark is, that the miracle would not be the less true and evident, though Archbishop Marechal had denied both the one and the other; so that, without disrespect to his memory, his opinion weighs nothing in the examination of the evidence.

In his page 11, this writer states, that "there was room to believe that the persons concerned in the publication of the documents were doubtful whether to publish a statement or not." "As evidence of great hesitation, fear and controversy, no less than twice was the pamphlet set in type to the extent of twenty-four pages, and as often suppressed. This information is from those who, on account of their connexion with the mechanical part of the pamphlet, had every opportunity of knowing." This statement is made by an anonymous writer, who gives us no tangible witnesses; yet I could scarcely have believed that it would have been so distinctly put forth without some ground for its semblance of truth. The Reverend Mr. Matthews who prepared and published the documents, assured me that it was altogether false, and after the most minute inquiry, I could discover nothing which could lead me to believe that the writer was even misled.

In page 12, the writer states "I have no objection to believe that Mrs. Mattingly's cure has been extraordinary." "I should deny the disease to have been a cancer." I care not what it will be called, I only contend that it was a desperate and generally reputed incurable disease. I do not give it any name. "I should deny the cure to have been so sudden and so perfect as has been represented. I should be able to point out many gross contradictions in the several depositions, and by proving the real nature of the disease should show the restoration to have been much less unusual and wonderful than has been supposed." He denies not the restoration, but he denies that it was miraculous. I have not yet entered upon this part of the question. But previous to my doing so, I look for his exhibition of "gross contradictions."

In page 14, "he charges Mrs. Mattingly, Father Dubuisson, and the five ladies who were present at the time of the miracle, with suppressing the fact of a very considerable discharge of blood, and so forth, from the mouth immediately before the restoration. That such a discharge did take place, those in the way of conversing with Roman Catholics in the days of excitement and wonder, perfectly remember to have heard asserted over and over again. Intimate friends of Mrs. Mattingly and of the priest declared it. Those who went to behold the wonder heard of it in the house, and from the advocates of the miracle." To support this serious allegation, no witness is produced. I have examined closely, and been assured by all with whom I spoke, and they were Mrs. Mattingly and her attendants at the time referred to, as well as several of the family, and of the other witnesses who were continually in and near the house at the time alluded to, as well as the priests, that

each and every one of the assertions contained in the extract, is a distinct falsehood. The effort which he makes to prove that they have admitted that an ordinary discharge of blood and matter took place, by swearing that they perceived no extraordinary discharge, is a miserable subterfuge of such a mind as I shall not describe. The whole passage will so perfectly characterize the piece that I insert it.

"I charge the depositions of those, who were present at the time of the miracle, with a very suspicious want of candour in their statements. Why do Mrs. Mattingly, Father Dubuisson, and the five ladies who were present, entirely abstain from all mention of a fact so important to the truth, as that of a very considerable discharge of blood, and so forth, from the mouth, immediately before the restoration? That such a discharge did take place, those in the way of conversing with Roman Catholics, in the days of excitement and wonder, perfectly remember to have heard asserted over and over again. Intimate friends of Mrs. Mattingly and of the priests declare it. Those who went to behold the wonder, heard of it in the house and from the advocates of the miracle. Why did not the deponents include this occurrence? If true, had it not such a bearing upon the question at issue, that candour required its publication? If untrue, why have they not denied it? Undoubtedly they would have been glad to deny it, had common honesty permitted, for well they were aware, that it stood as a formidable obstacle in the way of their cause, and as such was constantly employed by their opponents. But perhaps some will say they have denied it. I say, on the contrary, they have unintentionally granted it. Does Mrs. Mattingly declare there was no such occurrence? She says nothing of the kind; but only asserts, in opposition to the idea of an abscess having broken, that she 'perceived no breaking or discharge of any' abscess. Whether an abscess broke or not, we shall decide hereafter, on better judgment than that of the patient; but that a discharge took place immediately before the miracle, this lady could not deny. But do not the five ladies who were present deny this occurrence? On the contrary, they virtually acknowledge it. Remark their language. They declare that they saw no symptom of any abscess; perceived no extraordinary discharge whatever; on the contrary, 'she was so weak and low, that she appeared to spit with great pain and difficulty, and very little at a time.' This may all have been true, and yet a very considerable discharge may have occurred. If not, why not say so; why only assert that no extraordinary one took place, and that she spit very little at a time? That an ordinary discharge occurred, is not then denied. But we are told that a 'copious puking of blood' was ordinary. Something of this sort, therefore, is not denied to have taken place at the time of the cure. Now I ask whether it was not demanded by common justice, that this fact should have been mentioned in the statement? And yet, had it not been for public remarks which they thought it important to meet, this important particular would never have been even alluded to; for in all the original depositions of the persons above named, it is not even once hinted, and it is only in two supplementary papers, suggested by the conversation of the people, that it finds a notice. The fact is, that when the wonder was first promulgated, and every effort was made to represent the disease of Mrs. Mattingly in as horrible and hopeless a light as possible, it was constantly declared that such was her low estate that, even at the very moment of recovery, she threw up an immense quantity of blood; but afterwards, when this fact came to be used as an evidence against the miraculous

character of the cure, it was suppressed. A true miracle challenges scrutiny; desires no concealment. Truth is always candid.''

The answer to all this is obvious. When the fact of the restoration was notorious and could not be contradicted, an effort was made to destroy its value as a miracle, by stating that it was merely the natural process of abscess. This not having been anticipated, was met by the supplemental affidavits, and now the effort was made to destroy their force by the puny sophistry which will stoop to any artifice rather than admit the truth. The affidavits deny any discharge whatever. They describe the difficulty even of spitting, and one of the sisters described to me the danger of strangulation from a clotted bloody spit resting in the passage of the throat, and the great difficulty of its removal, Mrs. Mattingly being altogether unable to make any effort herself to aid for that purpose.

But Most Reverend sir, the single fact of her receiving the holy Eucharist, is abundant proof that there was not only no discharge by the mouth, but that there was no disposition thereto; for if there was, Mr. Dubuisson would be highly criminal if he administered this holy sacrament.

I now proceed to the ''gross contradictions.'' The first is stated to be between those who swore that she was ''directly, in the twinkling of an eye, restored to perfect health,'' and those who swore that the occurrence did not take place for ''about five or six minutes after she received.'' Here there is no contradiction, but the most perfect agreement, for all the testimony shows, that when the priest gave her the sacrament, she was unable to swallow it for five or six minutes, owing to the dry state of her tongue. During this time the priest was wrapping up his pix, and directly after she swallowed the Eucharist, she, in the twinkling of an eye, was restored. Nearly three pages are occupied in the effort to establish a contradiction here. I would, for the correct statement, merely refer to pages 17 and 18 of this examination.

The next ''gross contradiction'' is between the statements that she was restored to perfect health without a vestige of disease, and yet that she was emaciated and had a pale countenance. The effort for this does not extend beyond a page, and the writer endeavours to confound health and corpulency, between which there is an obvious distinction. This closes his efforts at establishing contradictions.

He next, in page 19, adverts to suspicious circumstances.

The first is, that although a miracle was expected by those in the secret, yet very few Papists were apprised of it; ''and besides the

testimony of the Romish eye-witnesses, some Protestants should have been called;" "some intelligent Protestants, a cleryman or two; some persons not easily duped in such matters." "Not only were the eye-witnesses confined to a few Romish ladies besides the officiating priest, but we remark a most suspicious absence of certain persons, who, on the supposition of their anticipating a miracle, most certainly ought to have been there." He then, in just such unmannerly language as the above, enumerates Father Kohlmann, Mr. Matthews, and the brothers of the lady, as well as her physicians. In the course of his amplification, he bestows upon all of them, except the physicians, the low abuse of his vulgar sneers. Before I proceed to observe upon what might be considered semblance of argument in the above, I shall take the opportunity of remarking upon the total absence of good manners, which characterizes this and similar productions. Upon the members of the great church of Christendom—of that church which has given to the world some of its greatest luminaries and best benefactors, and which has always comprehended in its fold the largest collection of the literature and civilization of every age for fourteen or fifteen, perhaps I might safely say, the last sixteen centuries—they generally bestow the most insulting appellations of a vulgar nomenclature, specially made for the purpose by themselves, and yet they claim to be gentlemen, and in most other cases, they deserve the character which they here forfeit. They arrogate to themselves a superior degree of intellect and information, as in this passage the writer gives us "intelligent Protestants," with his "clergyman or two," in italics; when, in truth, after very extensive opportunities and much close observation, I am very far from allowing the extraordinary pretensions of those gentlemen to any superiority of either intellect or information. As a body, they now have, and have had amongst them, like all other bodies, men of talents and erudition; so have other societies; so have lawyers, physicians, and so perhaps have the religious teachers of other Protestant denominations, besides those from whom this arrogance has proceeded on this and on several other occasions. Perhaps, Most Reverend sir, we need not go outside our own province to find men in our own clergy, who shrink from public observation, to whom we could, without hesitation, commit the credit of our literary or religious information, in competition with the coryphæi of this over-confident sect. I know five or six humble priests, whose names are scarcely whispered outside the precincts in which they move, for whose philosophical, historical, theological, and critical knowledge, I have more respect than for . . .

A more modest tone would be more in keeping with the Christian character, which those gentlemen arrogate!

I come to remark upon the argument. It assumes what is not the fact, that a miracle was looked for with certainty; and the untruth of this assumption destroys all that would legitimately follow from its truth. We teach that on extraordinary occasions, such as the establishment of a new revelation or mode of church government, God's special commission is required, and it is necessary that the person claiming to create a new religion, or to reform against the will of its ordinary governors, that which previously existed, ought to prove his commission by miracles; but this religion or reformation having been thus lawfully established, it is no longer necessary to have recourse to the special proof required in an extraordinary case, though miracles might be thereafter occasionally wrought for the purpose of confirming the evidence of truth to those under its influence, and for other wise and salutary ends. But though, in this first case, it would be fitting that the very enemies of truth should be present, it is not of such necessity in the latter case. Besides, these latter miracles are not promised specially to be performed, at particular times and on designated occasions; but generally to be performed from time to time, and only occasionally, as might seem proper to the Creator, and not to the creature. When performed, their evidence is perfect, but no person can, without special revelation, or gift of prophecy, foretell with certainty, when one will occur, though frequently from a concurrence of circumstances, a firm hope, and a lively expectation may be lawfully and piously indulged; yet it would be a criminal rashness to say, or to promise with certainty that it will take place; and, except the gift of prophecy was manifest, it would be folly to look for this result as certainly to follow.

There was indeed, in this case, a hope and expectation that God would miraculously interfere, but there was no certainty; and this distinction, so familiar to us, and so consonant to common sense and to the experience of centuries, not only in the Christian church, but previously in the true church of Israel, is destroyed by the sophist who assumes what is not a fact, that there existed a certain and positive foreknowledge of the event. Hence, his remarks fall with his supposition. He would destroy the miracle, because we do not assert that there was prophecy also.

He quotes Father Kohlmann's expressions to Mrs. Mattingly, that the worse she felt, the better; for the restoration would be more certain, to show that the certain and positive foreknowledge existed, or

was pretended to have been in existence. The words only show strong faith in God, and great hope on the part of Father Kohlmann. Mr. Matthews informed me, that on the night of the 9th of March, he firmly expected that Mrs. Mattingly would be restored; but certainly this firm expectation is far from the gift of prophecy. He stated to me, that his reason for this expectation, was the perfect resignation of Mrs. Mattingly to the will of God, and the complete sacrifice of herself and of her own will. Whilst he found in some others, who prayed also for restoration, an anxiety arising from mere human motives. Hence he told Mr. Dubuisson on that night, at their parting, his hope that this lady would be restored; but that he had not the same expectation in any of the other cases; and that when Mr. Dubuisson called on him after the restoration, before it was yet clear day, he was prepared for the tidings, which, however, produced in him sensations that he could not describe.

The object, however, of the pamphleteer, was evidently to insinuate that there was some collusion between those who were *in the secret,* as he prints it in *italics.* Let the evidence itself and the character of the individual witnesses answer this. Let it be answered by the inhabitants of Washington. Let it be tested by the state in which the lady was seen by Protestants and Catholics, just previously to that night, and immediately on the next day.

The "next suspicious circumstance," is a charge made upon the priests for not having her cured sooner, and for manifesting "a most criminal and inhuman indifference in the case of Mrs. Mattingly, or of a most heretical scepticism as to the efficacy of Hohenlohe's prayers," and concludes by stating his "belief that all the application to Hohenlohe has been, on their parts, nothing in the world but a farce." As this is but buffoonery, and not argument, I leave it unexamined.

The next argument is, that although the same means were used for others, they were not restored; "like a child shooting into a flock at random, and killing one bird." The paragraph contains a variety of other similar illustrations, but no more argument. This also rests upon a false assumption, viz., that there was an infallibly miraculous influence or efficacy in those means. We uniformly assert the miracle to have been wrought by God, who promised, occasionally, but not uniformly, to give this manifestation of his power, and presence, and protection. We may say, in the words of Paley, "If it be answered that when we ascribe the cure of the palsy to a touch, of blindness to the anointing of the eyes with clay, or the raising of the dead to a word, we lay ourselves open to this imputation, we reply, we ascribe

no such effects to such causes. We perceive no virtue or energy in these things, more than in other things of the same kind. They are merely signs to connect the miracle with its end. The effect we ascribe simply to the volition of the Deity, of whose existence and power, not to say of whose presence and agency, we have previous and independent proof."

We merely say, that if, in this instance, the facts be truly stated, there was a miracle, which, if wrought at all, must have been the work of God, and the truth or falsehood of the statements must be determined by an examination of the special case. We neither state that there were other miracles, nor do we either assert or admit that, to sustain the truth of those statements, it was necessary that other miracles should have been wrought. Had there been several, each should have rested on its own merits singly.

The next objection is, that the miracle was not wrought at the exact hour that it was expected, and by appointment, ought to have occurred; for, according to the priests, three o'clock in the morning, and not fifteen minutes past four, ought to have been the hour. I would merely ask, whether if a person does not perform an act until an hour after he had previously determined upon its performance, it would be true to assert that he had not performed it? In this case it was performed as soon as she had swallowed the sacrament. As it is sought to establish that there existed a difference, it might be as well to see the grounds. The writer asserts that the miracle was expected to take place the moment the Prince Hohenlohe, in Bamberg, Europe, prayed for those out of Europe, which was at nine o'clock, A. M., corresponding, according to the priests, to three, A. M., in Washington. But the lady's restoration, according to the watch of the officiating priest, was not till fifteen minutes after four." "There was no coincidence," "there was not the smallest connexion," "a miss is as good as a mile in these matters." I do not now contend that the miracle occurred by reason of the prayers of any one. I merely contend that it did take place. I do not place the miraculous nature of the occurrence in any coincidence of either time or facts, but in the sudden restoration and the perfect restoration. This objection admits both, and therefore leaves all that I contend for untouched. However, it might be as well that I should here dispose altogether of the assertions it contains. There is a misrepresentation of the time and of the other circumstances. The time was not said to be exactly three o'clock, as the writer asserts. The words are, "so that here, three o'clock after midnight is about the corresponding hour to nine in the morning, at Bam-

berg, where the prince usually resides," and if the writer took the trouble to calculate the difference in longitude, he would find not only miles, but degrees, wanting to give the word about the latitude of at least fifteen or twenty minutes. He would also recollect, that a Mass begun at nine o'clock, is not terminated until half-past nine; and he ought to know that in all such calculations, it is usual to allow something for the difference of watches, not to speak of those occasional accidents which may cause a delay in the acts of the most punctual persons. When all these are added together, the apparent difference of time vanishes to a point. But there were other conditions, one of the most important of which amongst those that were essential, was, "the reception of the Eucharist." Now all the witnesses who were present, testify, that as soon as she swallowed this sacrament, which is, I need scarcely remark to you, essential to its reception, she was instantly, in the twinkling of an eye, restored. Thus, to use his own vulgar expressions, there was neither "a mile," nor "a miss."

The latter part of this paragraph, in page 25, is far more reprehensible, for it asserts several distinct untruths, which would not, even if true statements, affect the evidence. He asserts that it "plainly appears from the documents, that at the time of the change in the disease, the officiating priest had given up whatever expectation of success he had at first entertained." Mrs. Mattingly, "whatever may have been her faith before the arrival of the appointed hour, had now surrendered every hope, and was waiting the hour of dissolution." Upon this, I shall remark what I learned from herself, as to her sentiments, and they correspond exactly with the words in her depositions, but whose meaning it is attempted to distort in this and in the next paragraph. This good lady had perfect and lively faith in the power and goodness of God, and knew that he was able in an instant to restore her if he pleased, but knowing that she had no claim upon him to demand his positive intervention to suspend the laws of nature, and knowing that she was naturally hastening to an immediate death, she made an act of perfect resignation to his holy will, looking with indifference upon life and death, determined as far as she was able, to serve him in either; and thus she calmly awaited either repose or resuscitation. She never, at any moment, dared to look with certainty to his miraculous interference, though she believed firmly in his power and his mercy. Thus, to the moment of her restoration, her sentiments were unchanged, and "at the moment of receiving the blessed sacrament, she felt so extremely ill, that believing the time arrived when she must either die, or through the mercy and goodness of God be

restored to health, she made this mental prayer or aspiration, "Lord Jesus! thy holy will be done." His next falsehood is that "she said at four o'clock what is not in the pamphlet, but was industriously circulated soon after the event, in proof of the extremity of her illness, that she was not to be restored, because too unworthy." For this assertion he brings no witnesses; and I have full evidence that she never used the expression, and I have as much as the case will admit of, that it never was circulated by any of her friends. The next falsehood is, that Mr. Dubuisson "seeing the case so hopeless, prepares to retire in disappointment." So far from this being true, it is clear, from his own affidavit, and from the short lapse of time which intervened between his giving the sacrament and her swallowing it, and being restored to perfect health, that he had not fully concluded that prescribed ceremonial, when she declared herself well, for the pix with the sacrament had not been yet removed from the table.

The next paragraph is one of those efforts which I shall not characterize, but which we are frequently doomed to witness: an attempt to prove that a fact which has occurred, was impossible. It argues the impossibility of her having been cured, upon the assumption that the lady had not the proper faith. In this, perhaps, the writer has a better excuse than can be offered for his former dishonesty. Perhaps, like many others, he mistakes presumption for faith.

I have now disposed of his charges of contradiction and suspicion, and believe it is very evident that my former conclusion is unshaken. It remains to be examined whether this sudden and perfect restoration was miraculous.

The writer of the pamphlet to which I have adverted, states in page 30, "It is a maxim with regard to miracles that no effect is to be considered miraculous, which admits of explanation upon natural principles." Of course, I will implicitly subscribe to this maxim, and it was therefore that I applied to the respectable body of our physicians for an explanation, upon natural principles, convinced, that if it could be at all given, I should get it from them. I have not obtained any such explanation, and several individual members of the faculty have repeatedly assured me, that it could not be given. The pamphleteer, however, undertakes, in page 26, to show, that the lady's complaint was not a cancer. Upon this, I shall not give a line, as I do not look upon it as affecting the case, to say what it was not. In page 28, he acknowledges that his proof that it was not a cancer, is negative.

He then undertakes to prove that the lady "was affected with an abscess." "Throw this pamphlet, (the documents from 1 to 33) into

the hands of a scientific physician; let it tell its own story, and you will not find an individual, who, connecting the progress of the disease with the event, will not pronounce it an abscess."

"I have conversed with five medical men upon this subject, four in this district, and one at a distance, all of whom, after ridiculing the pretensions of the priests relative to the miraculous nature of the cure, pronounced the disease an abscess. The simple statement of the pamphlet was put into the hands of an eminent physician at a distance, who, after perusing the symptoms, decided at once that it was an abscess in the left lobe of the liver; mentioning at the same time, that he had known at least ten similar cases, just as remarkable, in the course of his own practice.

"Assuming now the existence of an abscess, we readily account for the torpor of the arm next to the tumour. We easily account, also, for the nature of the cure. The simple fact is, that just before the change in the lady's feelings, this abscess broke. The circumstances were exactly calculated to produce this effect; for we are told in the fifth deposition, that just before it took place, the patient was seized with 'a violent fit of coughing;' which in union with some preparations on the part of the priest caused a delay of fifteen minutes in the administration of the sacrament. So violent was this paroxysm of coughing, that Father Dubuisson says he was afraid 'she might be prevented from receiving communion.' Now, nothing was more likely than that this paroxysm of her cough, in union with the excitement in which she had been, from the expectation of a miracle, and the excitement she then must have been in from disappointment, and that also, necessarily produced by all the ceremony and solemnity of receiving the communion, should have affected her frame so powerfully as to occasion the discharge of the abscess in her side. The symptoms of unusual distress and danger immediately before, are perfectly consistent with this; for such almost always precede the breaking of an abscess. Now let it be recollected, that for several days subsequent to the relief, it was asserted at the house of the lady, that a very copious discharge of blood from her mouth occurred immediately prior to the issue; let it also be recollected, that though some deponents, in order to rid the matter of the abscess, exert themselves to show that no extraordinary discharge of blood was perceived, and though Mrs. M. asserts that she spit with unusual difficulty, and in quantities unusually small that night, it is yet not denied that an effusion of blood from the mouth, did actually take place, and that in a considerable quantity, just before the event; and methinks it cannot be doubted by any one the least intelligent on such subjects, that the simple explanation of the whole affair, is found in the fortunate and very seasonable rupture of an abscess. Cases precisely similar are found in almost every chapter of medical journals. What physician of extensive and long-continued practice, has not been favoured with miracles as marvellous?

"But that which has seemed unaccountable to many, is that the patient's strength should so soon have been recovered. The explanation of this is simple. After allowing for the great exaggerations already detected; as to the suddenness and perfection of the cure; nothing remains but what has often been equalled in cases of this disease. After the breaking of an abscess, all obstruction, pressure and pain are relieved; the patient is at once sensible of a material alteration in his state; the disease being extirpated, the limbs, which before sympathized with the system in its pain, now sympathize in its relief; they recover their motion, and in some measure, revive in their strength; thus, though weakness continues and emaciation,

it often appears that the patient can rise and walk, and go about some of the ordinary occupations of life. This is but a description of cases, of which every physician has read, and perhaps had experience, and it is precisely a description of the case of Mrs. Mattingly. We want nothing therefore out of the common history of abscesses, to account for all the stages of her relief. That she was able in a few minutes after the rupture to arise from bed, and go about her room, is by no means unparalleled; and that she could endure so much fatigue as her public exhibition for some time after required, is easily explained by the great excitement necessarily produced from the idea that she was the subject of miraculous power, and from the gaze and wonder and fuss, of the crowds coming to behold her. Thus it seems that all this astonishing exertion of miraculous power; this resurrection, as Mr. Kohlmann calls it, so far from a deviation from the known laws of nature—is, to say the most of it, but a remarkable example of the ordinary course of those laws. Did we choose to push this matter as far as would be practicable, it might be shown without much difficulty, that almost the whole of the extraordinary character of this affair rises not from anything singular or strange in the connexion between the nature of the disease and of its cure, for that connexion is natural and evident; but rather from the fact that a disease like that of Mrs. Mattingly in all the extremity of its symptoms, is not sufficiently common to make its natural cure a matter of ordinary observation. Hence it is, that to physicians acquainted with the records of disease, and extensively observant of its forms and changes, to whom an effect which to others would seem extraordinary is but a companion of similar effects with which medical tradition has furnished them; the event in question is a cause of no astonishment, except that, by so many persons, it should for a moment be supposed either miraculous or unaccountable.''

I have preferred giving the entire of the argument in the words of the writer himself. In page 26, writing of Miss Fitzgerald's assertion ''that a physician who had examined Mrs. Mattingly, declared several times in her presence, that her malady was, in his opinion, an internal cancer,'' he remarks, ''Here we might justly require the name of that physician, for the purpose of confronting him with the deponent; and we might show that the concealment of his name in such a case as this, would well excuse the rejection of the deponent's testimony.'' The writer cannot object to the use of his own principle against himself, and especially as we have in his case, only an invisible witness to the opinions of unknown physicians. I have put the documents into the hands of several physicians, and each of them told me, after their perusal, that no physician who had any regard for his character, would avow himself as holding the opinion that it was a case of abscess, and that the whole history of medicine did not furnish a case which bore any analogy to this, and that it was totally inexplicable upon any principle of medical reasoning. I shall make a few remarks upon the falsehoods contained in the above extract, before I proceed to give an outline of the medical reasoning, as far as I may presume to attempt it.

It is stated that the lady was excited from the expectation, disappointment, and ceremony. Her own affidavit informs us, "I calmly and without agitation of mind, awaited." I have shown before, that there was no disappointment. It is altogether untrue, that "for several days subsequent to the relief, it was asserted at the house of the lady, that a very copious discharge of blood from her mouth occurred, immediately prior to the issue." It is untrue, that "it is not denied that an effusion of blood from the mouth did actually take place, and in a considerable quantity, just before the event;" for Mrs. Mattingly denies it in her affidavit in these words, "such, indeed, was my exhausted and debilitated state, that it was with great difficulty I could spit at all during the night,—and what I did spit was in smaller quantity than usual;" and by this she distinctly and repeatedly assured me she intended to convey a knowledge of what was the fact, that the only discharge of any sort which took place was what she spit. It is denied by the five ladies who have sworn in contradiction to the report not in the house of the lady, or by her friends, but by those who opposed her friends by falsely asserting that there was an extraordinary discharge of blood, "that they perceived no extraordinary discharge whatever;" and it could not have taken place without their observation; also, it is contradicted by their description of the entire discharge during the whole night, "that she appeared to spit with great pain and difficulty, and very little at a time."

Upon this view I might rest the case, because the grounds for the assertion of abscess are hereby removed. But I go farther, and say, that we have the distinct swearing of Mrs. Mattingly herself, in contradiction to the "erroneous opinion" of several of her visiters, who "asked her if her cure was not effected by the breaking of an abscess in her side, and a copious discharge from it?" It could not have occurred without her perception of it, and she swears that she had no such perception. It is contradicted by the other five ladies, who swear, "that some persons have attributed her cure to the breaking of an abscess, and the copious discharge of its contents;" they "therefore solemnly declare that no such occurrence took place in Mrs. Mattingly's regard." I shall not waste more time or paper with a remark upon the writer's extraordinary assertion in contradiction to this testimony.

"We now assert that the lady was afflicted with an abscess. To be sure she says she had no knowledge of any abscess in her side, and 'of course, perceived no breaking or discharge of any.' This, we doubt not, is true, and still there may have been an abscess and its discharge. All the symptoms may have existed, and the patient, not very skilful in medicine probably, may have been ignorant of the disease to which they belonged. The same may be said relative to the five ladies who

depose that they 'saw no symptom of any abscess.' These ladies, I presume, never studied very closely the diseases to which the human frame is liable."

He says, that "an eminent physician decided at once, that it was an abscess in the left lobe of the liver."

I am but poorly skilled in medicine, yet, from the conversations which I have had on this subject with several medical men, I shall undertake to show that it was not.

The left lobe of the liver is under the diaphragm; in a healthy subject, it stands very little beyond the centre of the body, towards the left side; in a disordered and swoln state of the lobe it might extend farther. I shall now admit whatever extent the reader might please, still this lobe must continue under the diaphragm; the first attack of this lady was above the diaphragm. All the documents show that the pain concentrated to a spot upon the left breast: and that in that spot there was found a lump from which that pain radiated. The several members of her family, together with Doctors Jones and M'Williams, support her own statement to this effect,—and the physicians gave it as their opinion, that "it partook of a schirrous character;" that "although it was not a cancer at that time, yet it would be safe and advisable to have it extirpated, as in time it might become one." Thus, the commencement of the disorder, was not under, but was over the diaphragm; not in the left lobe of the liver, but "in the lower and outer part of the left mamma," having the pectoral muscles, the ribs, the pleura, and portions of the lungs, together with the pericardium and diaphragm intervening between the spot of the tumour and the left lobe of the liver. The liver might be diseased, and healed, and yet this tumour and its consequence would remain. There is no connexion, save that of general sympathy, between the two species of disorder. We have no proof whatever that the liver was diseased, but we have the most satisfactory evidence that the disease originated in the mamma, and exhibited itself in such a tumour as could not be produced by an affection of the liver.

The writer of the pamphlet, then, in order to evade one miracle, calls upon us to admit two; for he requires us to admit two physical impossibilities, against positive evidence of facts which contradict his supposition. First, he requires us to believe that a tumour in the mamma, hard, and of the shape of a pigeon's egg, was the consequence of a disease in the left lobe of the liver, though we have no testimony of any such disease. Secondly, that an abscess of the liver was discharged without any consciousness of its discharge by the patient or her attendants, though she was awake and they were vigilant; but

the reason given in the pamphlet is still more extraordinary. "These ladies, I presume, never closely studied the diseases to which the human frame is liable." A discharge of blood and matter was a symptom which they had frequently witnessed before, and testified in this lady's case; and I am not aware of its requiring any medical skill to observe and to testify such a symptom.

Upon this simple view of facts, it is very evident that her disease was not in the left lobe of the liver, and further, that she was not cured by what the writer calls "the breaking of an abscess;" for the testimony contradicts the occurrence of any discharge on that night, save the very small quantity which she spat.

I now proceed to farther proof that there was no abscess. The contents discharged from an abscess in the left lobe of the liver, must have passed either through the lungs, or the stomach and bowels. Let us suppose each in succession, and examine if it was physically compatible with the facts which we have so evidently established. If either was more probable than the other, according to his description it would appear to have been the former,—for he attributes the breaking principally to the fit of coughing, which would indicate the lungs to have been affected. We must, in this case, suppose the sac in the liver, which contained the matter, to have broken, the contents to have passed through the diaphragm into the lungs, which, in this lady's case, would in all probability have produced immediate suffocation. But supposing, against evidence, that the contents passed from the lungs through the mouth, it was physically impossible that they should have so completely passed away, as to have left no remnant; the presence of which would have been indicated by a cough that would have subsided gradually as the lungs were relieved. Yet the evidence distinctly establishes the fact, that she was perfectly free from any symptom of cough on the day of her restoration. Day after day we have similar evidence. Let us suppose the contents to have passed away by the stomach, though the writer, by his over minuteness, has deprived himself of this retreat; still, as the object is close investigation to establish truth, not the paltry effort of achieving a victory over a self-contradictory pamphlet, I must examine this possibility. The testimony of the subject and of her companions puts this possibility out of question altogether,—for there must in this case have been a very extraordinary discharge by the mouth or otherwise, which is distinctly negatived by all the witnesses. There is another fact sworn to by her brother, which is quite incompatible with either supposition, —that on that very morning, in a very short time after her restoration,

he observed her spittle, for the first time in six years, to have a clear and healthful appearance, being "white like that of a healthy person." We must, then, in order to believe the rupture of an abscess, believe a number of physical impossibilities; so that, take it in either way, we must believe a miracle.

But I have not enumerated half the absurdities of the supposition. In case of the rupture of an abscess, there should have been an inflammation in the sides of the sac previous to their union, which necessarily would have produced pain and uneasiness in the patient. An ulcerative process necessarily takes place in the parts through which the contents are discharged, which is evinced by pain, uneasiness, and soreness, accompanying the formation of the ulcer, consequent to that formation, and during the time of its healing. This would continue for some weeks, if not months. There would be also great occasional nausea and delicacy of appetite. Yet here the testimony of a great number of medical and other witnesses is united to that of the subject of this restoration, in contradiction to the existence of any one of those symptoms. In either side of this dilemma, also, we must believe in the existence of a miracle.

I now come to the assertion that she was sustained through the fatigue of the 10th of March by excitement. Excitement is unusual action, beyond what is natural, incompatible with the ease and tranquillity of the system—is always succeeded by weakness and prostration of the system which had been excited; and where this excitement is very great, the collapse is dangerous, often fatal, especially in an exhausted system. Hence, the great caution which is always observed to prevent over excitement in convalescents. The exhaustion of the system of a convalescent is generally, indeed we may say always, in the combined ratio of the duration and the violence of the previous disease, together with abstinence from nutriment during the illness; and the more exhausted the system of the convalescent, and the greater the excitement, the greater will be the subsequent prostration.

Had this lady been restored by the discharge of an abscess on the morning of the 10th, after the suffering of six years, and been thus relieved from the disease, yet, from her state of prostration, it would have required a miraculous interference of the Deity to enable her to go through the fatigue of that day; and the collapse, if she had not been miraculously restored or sustained, had she been upheld only by excitement, would have been of the most desperate character, if not fatal.

But the evidence is in direct contradiction to the proposition.

A person under great excitement has not a very pale countenance; on the contrary, it is generally flushed and coloured; sometimes changing its hectic appearance, but never steadily pale, as hers is by so many sworn to have been. The subject of excitement does not evince harmony and tranquillity of system, as she did. I might proceed yet farther in the contrast,—but it is unnecessary.

I shall now briefly advert to another solution which I understand a physician of this city has suggested, viz., that the contents of an abscess formed in the breast broke into the cavity of the pleura, and were subsequently absorbed.

Upon this I would merely remark, that it removes only a very few of the difficulties which exist against the supposition of abscess in the left lobe of the liver. It leaves the seat of the disorder, indeed, in its proper place, but it creates new difficulties; for it would, against what we see to have been the fact, contract the space of the lungs, and exhibit the patient under serious consequent oppression and difficulty of breathing, which would be relieved only as the absorption proceeded. In truth, the only difficulties removed by this, would be that of reconciling the rupture of the abscess and the non-existence of an external discharge; in place of which, it would create the new difficulty of lodging the contents in the cavity of the pleura, without affecting the respiration, which we clearly see was not affected. It also gets rid of the absurdity of creating an affection of the liver without the exhibition of any of its symptoms, and making the rupture of an abscess in the left lobe of the liver remove a disease which originated and continued deeply seated in the lower and outward part of the left breast.

But suppose all this naturally accounted for, still we have no attempt to give any natural explanation of the healing of the ulcerated back and shoulders.

I have now, Most Reverend sir, at considerably more length than I had anticipated, gone through the details of this testimony. I have sought in every way to find whether there could exist a doubt as to any of the facts in the statement—and the more closely and jealously I examined, the more am I convinced of the irrefragable truth of these facts. Convinced of their truth, I used my best efforts to obtain a solution upon natural principles, if possible. I am convinced if such could be had, I should have received it from the respectable society to which I applied, and whose president, in a polite and candid note, gave me his own opinion, previous to laying the statement before the society itself. I have conversed with several gentlemen of the

faculty for whose opinions and judgment great respect is entertained; and this not only lately, but frequently during six years. And I feel equally convinced, as I do of the truth of the facts, that they are physically insoluble and inexplicable—that it was an immediate and miraculous interference of the Creator himself.

I shall here adopt the words of Bishop Hay in his explanation of the Scripture doctrine of miracles. Describing the rules adopted by the Congregation of Rites at Rome for examinations of this description. Chapter xv., volume 2, cl. xxvii. and xxviii.

"XXVII. Miracles of the third order, such as miraculous cures of diseases, are examined in the strictest manner; and it must necessarily be proved to the conviction of the judges, that they were attended with all those circumstances which evidently show the operation was divine. The circumstances indispensably required in cures of diseases are as follows: 1st. That the disease be considerable, dangerous, inveterate, such as commonly resists the strength of known medicines, or at least that it be long and difficult by their means to produce a perfect cure. 2dly. That the disease be not come to its last period, in which it is natural to look for a remission of its symptoms and a cure. 3dly. That the ordinary helps of natural remedies have not been used, or at least that there be just reason to believe from the time elapsed since taking them, and other circumstances, that they could have no influence in the cure. 4thly. That the cure be sudden and momentaneous; that the violent pains or imminent danger cease all at once, instead of diminishing gradually, as happens in the operations of nature. 5thly. That the cure be perfect and entire. 6thly. That there happened no crisis, nor any sensible alteration which might have naturally wrought the cure. 7thly. That the health recovered be constant, and not followed by a speedy relapse.

"XXVIII. The concurrence of all these conditions and circumstances must be proved by the utmost evidence before the miraculousness of these facts can be approved; and in this discussion the greatest rigour is used. The promoter of the faith starts every possible difficulty; and to assist him in this, he is allowed to call in divines, physicians, natural philosophers, mathematicians, and others skilled in the respective matters belonging to the miracle under examination; to these the case is exposed, and if they can give any rational and natural account how the effect might be produced without having recourse to miracles, which the opposite party cannot gainsay, or if they can put any well founded objection against the miraculousness of the fact which the others cannot solve, the miracle is forthwith rejected. It is, however, true, in order that all justice may be done, that the solicitors for the cause are also allowed to call in learned people in the several sciences to their assistance, to answer the difficulties proposed by the promoter of the faith, and obviate his objections, if it be possible to do so."

The only question which could here arise, would be upon the second and sixth conditions. As respects the second, the death of the patient, and not such a remission of symptoms which could effect a cure, was expected. The same, indeed, might be said of the sixth. So that I cannot hesitate in distinctly reporting to you my full and entire

conviction that this restoration of Mrs. Mattingly was a palpable and splendid miracle.

It was my intention, Most Reverend sir, when I commenced this examination, to have here appended a short essay, exhibiting the application of this fact to the doctrines of our church. I am, however, obliged, for several reasons, to relinquish this determination. In the first place, I owe it to the ordinary of the diocess in which the occurrence took place, to give full time for the consideration of the evidence itself, as well as the opinion, of his predecessor, and of this examination and report. I am also at present just setting out upon the visitation of the southern division of my diocess, and under an engagement to assist at the consecration of a respectable brother prelate; so that my occupations would not permit the execution even though I should have continued my determination; and, indeed, the great and laborious duties of the late penitential season scarcely allowed me the opportunity of revising the report itself,—so that I fear you will have to make great allowance for imperfections. But a paramount consideration is the great importance of the subject, and the length to which the dissertation should extend in order to be in any way worthy of the matter. I would, therefore, much prefer, if your judgment should coincide with my opinion, to procure that an edition of Bishop Hay's most valuable work on Miracles should be published and generally read. In the perusal thereof the philosopher and the Christian would be equally instructed and delighted. And I should hope that thereby the public mind of America, which is upon those subjects calm, reflecting, and generally well disposed, though hitherto greatly abused and misled, would receive incalculable benefit.

I shall, therefore, merely remark upon the excellent principles of the restored blind man mentioned *John* ix. 25. "If he be a sinner, I know not; one thing I know, that whereas I was blind, I now see. 26. They then said to him, What did he to thee? How did he open thy eyes? 27. He answered them: I have told you already, and you have heard: why would you hear it again? Will you also become his disciples? 28. They reviled him therefore and said: Be thou his disciple; but we are the disciples of Moses. 29. We know that God spoke to Moses: but as to this man we know not whence he is. 30. The man answered, and said to them: Why herein is a wonderful thing, that you know not whence he is, and he hath opened my eyes. 31. Now we know that God doth not hear sinners; but if a man be a server of God, and doth his will, him he heareth. 32. From the beginning of the world it hath not been heard, that any one hath opened the eyes of one

born blind. 33. Unless this man were of God he could not do anything."

I know that to evade the conclusions which must necessarily result from the evidence of miracles, wrought in every age by God in our church, it has been sought to prove that none were wrought from at least an early period. What then, I would ask, was the restoration of Mrs. Mattingly, if not a miracle? And if it was a miracle, what must be the consequence when we unite this fact with the declaration of the Saviour? *Mark* xvi. 17, "And these signs shall follow them that believe: In my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues: 18. They shall take up serpents: and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover." *John* xiv.: "Otherwise, believe, for the very work's sake. Amen, amen, I say unto you, he that believeth in me, the works that I do, he shall do also, and greater than these shall he do; because I go to the Father."

I shall add no more, at least for the present.

Respectfully and affectionately in Christ.

Yours, with esteem,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

Charleston, S. C., April 14, 1830.

LETTERS FROM ROME

[The series of letters which follow were written to the editors of the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, by Dr. England, during his second visit to Rome, on the affairs of his Haytian Legation, and published in that paper at intervals, in 1834.]

July 1.—In my last, I gave you the principal acts of the secret consistory that was held on the 23rd ultimate. I do not recollect whether I mentioned that on the same day the holy father placed the cardinal's ring on the finger of each of the three to whom he gave their titles, viz.—Cardinals Monico, Brignole, and Grimaldi. On the afternoon of that day, when the new Cardinals Canali, Botiglia and Polidori, returned from the Vatican, where they had been to pay their respects to his Holiness, and to receive their red caps, they went to their respective homes, and immediately after dusk, fires were lighted, the illuminations displayed generally through the city, and the cardinals, the corps diplomatique, the prelates, the guard of nobles, the general staff of the army and militia, and the nobility of Rome, and foreign nobles then in the city, went to pay their respects to their eminences.

Cardinal Monico was attached by the holy father to the congregations for Apostolic Ordinary Visitation, Consistorial, Residence of Bishops, and Examination of Bishops in Theology.

Cardinal Brignole was attached to the congregations of the Index, of Sacred Rites, of Indulgences and Holy Relics, and of Examination of Bishops in Canon Law.

Cardinal Grimaldi was attached to the congregations of the Consulta, of Loretto, of Economy, and of Good Government.

Perhaps it might be well to inform your readers, that for the better despatch of business, it is in Rome, as in other places, divided into several portions, according to the various subjects; and the cardinals are divided into as many standing committees as there are subjects. A standing committee of this description is called a congregation, and like your standing committees of the judiciary, of ways and means, and so forth, these congregations are named each from the nature of the business given to its examination and regulation. The chairman is called Cardinal Prefect, and each congregation has its proper sec-

retary, who is to be found at stated hours in his office. Each cardinal belongs to several of those congregations;—they meet at stated periods, discuss and decide upon the business brought before them—their decisions are then reported to the Pope by the Cardinal Prefect, or by the secretary, who, at the proper time, receives either the confirmation, the modification, or the rejection of the holy father, and transmits to the proper prelate the order for execution: or whatever other order might be necessary. Besides the cardinals, there belong to those several congregations a select number of learned divines, canonists, and other persons of prudence and experience, as consultors, assessors, and so forth.—Printed briefs of the business to be considered, together with the documents to be examined, are given to the members, at least a full week previous to the period of discussion, and generally each cardinal consults one or more theologians and canonists, for whose opinion he has respect, besides hearing the regular officers of the congregation. The Pope has also his own canonists and theologians whom he consults if he finds any doubt as to the propriety of confirming the decisions of the congregation. The holy father is occupied several hours daily, in the consideration of these reports.

Monsignor Antonio Tosti, who has long presided with great efficiency and zeal over the great establishment of St. Michael, was appointed treasurer of the *Reverenda Camera Apostolica*, or state treasury. This is one of the offices from which the incumbent is, as a matter of course, promoted to the cardinalate. Monsignor Tosti does not immediately resign the charge of St. Michaels. The Archbishop of Ephesus, the Most Reverend John Soglia, succeeds Cardinal Canali as secretary of the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, and Monsignor Soglia is succeeded by the Most Reverend Ludovico Trevoli, Archbishop of Athens, as private almoner to the Pope. Monsignor John Charles Alessi, succeeds Cardinal Polidori as Secretary to the Congregation of the Council, and the Most Reverend Joseph Vespigniani, Archbishop of Thyana, succeeds the same Cardinal as Secretary to the Congregation for the Examination of Bishops. The Most Reverend Dominic Genovesi, Archbishop of Mytelene, succeeds to the Secretaryship of the Congregation of Indulgences and Holy Relies, vacated by the Archbishop of Athens. Several other appointments took place, but they were for mere temporal or civil administration.

On Tuesday the 24th, the festival of St. John the Baptist, and a special patron of the great church of Lateran, the first in dignity in the Christian world; as it ranks before St. Peter's on the Vatican, having been given by Constantine to the Pope. His Holiness went in

state to this great patriarchal basilic, to assist at the Pontifical Mass, which was chanted by the venerable Cardinal Pacca, dean of the Sacred College, and archpriest of the Lateran Church. Being a Papal chapel, the cardinals, archbishops, and bishops, assisted at the throne, the principal assistant at the throne, the magisterial delegates, prelates, and so forth, were present. Solemn vespers were chanted in the afternoon, at which the cardinals attended.

On Thursday the 26th, a public consistory was held in the ducal chamber at the Vatican, for the purpose of giving their hats to the new cardinals, viz., Tiberi, bishop of Jeoci, in the Papal states, and late Nuncio in Spain,—who was created cardinal in September 30th, 1831, and reserved *in petto*, his resignation published on the 2d of July, 1832, but who had arrived in Rome only within the previous week; Canali, Bottiglia, and Polidori. The four new cardinals went to the Sistine chapel, at the altar of which they successively were sworn in presence of the cardinal-dean, Pacca, first of the order of bishops,—Cardinal Galleffi Camerlengo of the holy Roman church, Cardinal Odescalchi, vice-chancellor, Doria-Pamphilia, first cardinal-priest present. Rivarola, first cardinal-deacon present, Mattei, Cardinal Camerlengo, of the sacred college, and the Most Reverend Lui Frezza, Archbishop of Chalcedon, secretary of the congregation of Consistory, and secretary of the sacred college.

The *Sala Regia*, or royal hall, of the Vatican palace is a splendid room of vast extent, to which you ascend by the *Scala Regia*, or royal staircase, which is a magnificent flight of steps between the church of St. Peter and the Vatican palace; as you enter, you have on your right, at one extremity of the hall, the gate which leads into the Pauline Chapel; on turning towards the left, and advancing about fifty or sixty feet into the room, you have on your left the gate of the Sistine Chapel, and on your right that of the *Sala Ducale* or ducal hall. On entering this hall, which is about fifty feet wide, it was found that the consistory was assembled. At the farther extremity, about one hundred feet distant, an elevated platform, to which there was an ascent of three steps, extended across the room; at either extremity was a large and massy door, tastefully decorated, raised on the platform midway between them, under a canopy of crimson and gold, the Papal throne was elevated three steps more, having on each side the flabelli displayed. The Pope was clothed in a rich cope, wearing a plain mitre of cloth of gold, with his domestic prelates, principal officers civil and military, and the guard of nobles, occupying the platform on each side. In front, at a moderate distance, the bench for cardinals ranged at

each side, and crossed nearly towards the third part of the hall, forming three sides of a parallelogram. The cardinal-dean sat at the inner extremity towards the Pope's right hand, wearing his purple cappa, with his train-bearers seated at his feet; five other cardinal-bishops sat on his right in their successive order, then the cardinal-priests according to their seniority; opposite the cardinal-dean the third senior cardinal-deacon sat, at the inner extremity of the bench, towards the left of his holiness and his junior brethren, extending outwards on his left, until the junior deacon was found near the junior priest; the two senior deacons stood on either side of the Pope. All the cardinals were similarly habited, and similarly attended. The prince Orsini, the head of the ancient Guelph family and present senator of Rome, stood as prince-assistant at the throne on the right of the first cardinal-deacon. On your right as you entered the room, a beautiful and convenient gallery, with open lattice work in front, had been erected for ladies, of whom there were several; the number that might be thus accommodated would be at least one hundred and fifty. Under these galleries, behind the cardinal-deacons and junior priests, there were accommodations for prelates and distinguished strangers. I observed in this place Captain Read of the Constellation frigate, and some of his officers. The space immediately next the cardinals' bench was occupied by the Swiss guard, drawn up in line across the hall, in their ancient costume, and having their spears. The rest of the room was filled with monks, friars, officers, civil and military, priests and laymen, of all nations and tongues.

Silence was proclaimed. Some of the consistorial advocates addressed the holy father upon various subjects, in the way of motions for consistorial decisions. Amongst them was one who made the preliminary motion for proceeding to the beatification of the venerable servant of God, Maria Clotilda Xavier, of Bourbon, a queen of Sardinia. Eight cardinals then left the hall—they were the deacons and junior priests—to introduce from the Sistine chapel the four cardinals who had just previously taken the oaths; when these four arrived in the hall, going successively to the throne, each kissed the Pope's right foot and right hand, after which the holy father embraced him on each cheek. They next went to their brethren of the sacred college, commencing with the cardinal-dean, and were embraced by each of them successively in like manner only on the cheek. After which each went on his knees before the holy father, who, with the proper prayer and suitable admonition, placed the red hats on their heads successively, and gave his blessing and retired. The cardinals then went to the

Sistine chapel with their newly admitted brethren; there the *Te Deum* was chaunted in superior style, at the conclusion of which the proper prayer was said for the new cardinals, who were again embraced by their brethren, of whom thirty-one were present. In the evening each new cardinal visited St. Peter's Church, then the cardinal-dean, and returning home, had a party of his friends, and appeared in full dress; during the assembly, the keeper of the Pope's wardrobe brought the hat in state, and delivered it with a suitable address, to which the cardinal made an appropriate answer,—and the palaces of the city were illuminated.

As a sort of supplement, I might add, that on the same afternoon the Pope received in the kindest manner, in his gardens, the visit of Captain Read, his lady, the chaplain (a Presbyterian clergyman), and eight or ten officers of the Constellation frigate, amongst whom there was only one Catholic, Lieutenant Francis Rall, of the marines; they were presented by Mr. Cicognani, the Consul of the United States.

July 7.—The great festival of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, was celebrated on Sunday the 29th, with the usual solemnity. Of course, you are aware that the celebration commences at first vespers; the church, in her celebration of public offices following the ancient Judaic mode of observing the ecclesiastical day, from evening until evening. At this point, therefore, all the great festivals commence.

The weather, at this time of the year, is nearly as warm as in Charleston; the thermometer generally being, at midday, about 27° of Reaumur, or 92° of Fahrenheit, without any sea breeze; there are, therefore, very few strangers in the city; hence, although I should suppose there were upwards of fifteen thousand persons at St. Peter's, it appeared almost deserted.

The procession left that hall of the Vatican, which is called the robing-room, at about half past five o'clock. It was not very large. The number of extraordinary chamberlains and chaplains, together with the other ecclesiastical officers who preceded the cross, in red sutans and surplices, did not appear to be over one hundred, probably an equal number of civil officers. The sub-deacon, accompained by his seven acolyths, followed them; behind him were the porters of the red staff. The swiss guards, in their ordinary dress, now dotted the remainder of the procession on either side; then followed the greater prelates under the episcopal order, probably about forty, the twelve penitentiaries of St. Peter's in red chasubles. The number of assistant-

bishops in red copes and plain white mitres was ten, the two junior of whom were the Right Reverend Dr. Baine, Bishop of Siga, and Vicar Apostolic of the western district of England, and the Bishop of Charleston. They were followed by the cardinal-deacons, about six in number, clothed in their dalmatics and mitred, having their train-bearers and other attendants. After them came about thrice as many cardinal-priests, mitred, wearing chasubles, and similarly attended; they were followed by five of the cardinal-bishops, mitred, wearing copes, and similarly attended. The governor of Rome, the Prince Orsini, who is senator of Rome, and assistant at the throne, together with the deputation from the Roman magistracy, surrounded by the general staff of the military, the guard of nobles and the mace-bearers, and a special detachment of the Swiss, carrying the large two-handed swords, followed. In the midst of this division came the Pope, in a cope and mitre of plain cloth of gold, having on either side the two senior cardinal-deacons then in the city, and followed by the major-domo, the treasurer, the chamberlain, the rest of the household, and a number of others.

As soon as his holiness arrived in the ducal hall, he was conducted to his chair, which was immediately raised upon their shoulders by the grooms in attendance, and was thus borne to the altar. The procession continued to advance through the royal hall, down the *Scala Regia*, until it arrived at the equestrian statue of Constantine, which is on your left as you descend, and about three-fourths of the space down to the ground-floor; then, turning to the right, it descended by a few steps into the vestibule of the great church of St. Peter. Here, the chapter of this basilic and its clerks, with the archpriest, Cardinal Galeffi, at the head, about sixty or seventy in number, received the array, allowing it to pass through two lines formed facing inward, in which the chapter and clergy stood arranged, in the centre of the vestibule itself; behind these lines, on each side, a range of military was formed in single file, and the people crowded the rear; across the middle of the vestibule, from the great centre gate of the church, towards that which opens in the porch to the front of the basilic, the respectable body of the Capitoline guards, in their fine uniform, were drawn up facing the archway which opened from the statue of Constantine. In the rear of the battalion, the military bands were stationed in front of the civic guards or militia, who were formed in line of two deep along the other wing of the vestibule leading towards the equestrian statue of Charlemagne, which, on the south side of the vestibule, corresponds with that of Constantine on the north.

As soon as the head of the procession entered this vestibule, the bands commenced occasional gratulations. Arrived at the great middle gate of bronze, the procession leaving the Capitoline guards on its left, turned to the right into the church. Here the regular troops were drawn up in single file, facing inwards, leaving in the centre a space of from sixty to eighty feet wide, for the procession which now began to move slowly up the centre towards the great altar under the dome; this mighty mass appeared to be of solid gold, blazing also with lights under its massive twisted columns and great canopy of Corinthian brass. The numerous lamps that burned round the balustrade of the confession, which shows the tomb of the apostle several feet below, seemed, in the distance, like the flowing of a stream of liquid fire lambent round the base of the majestic altar.

As soon as the holy father turned into the vestibule, the bands gave their full salute—the bells redoubled their enlivening peal, and the full voices of the capitular choir repeated, in solemn chaunt, the declaration of the Saviour, made eighteen centuries ago, to the predecessor of Gregory XVI. *Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram œdificabo ecclesiam meam, et portoe inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam.* "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." The holy father in meek, dignified humility, imparted the blessing as he was borne along. A rich canopy was sustained by prelates over his chair, and the flabelli waved majestically on either side. Over the vestibule, from a window that opened into the church, immediately over the great door, six trumpets announced the entrance of the holy father. The troops presented arms as the greater prelates who followed the cross advanced; but when the father of the faithful approached, with their arms still presented, they bent a knee. The masters of ceremony were from place to place along the line, and as the procession approached the chapel of the holy sacrament on the right, about four hundred feet after it had entered the church, it was arranged line within line on either side towards the gate of this chapel. The chair was let down, the holy father descended and knelt in adoration for a few moments; all knelt with him. He rose, resumed his seat, the lines began to extend forward, the procession advanced towards the choir that was enclosed beyond this great altar. Your readers ought to know that the platform and steps of this altar are not as usual in modern churches, towards the entrance, but having the back of the altar itself towards the principal gate, as was more usual in the ancient edifices. A partition covered with crimson damask and broad gold lace, was drawn across

the centre aisle about one hundred and fifty feet beyond the altar to its front, and, consequently, having the altar between it and the gate —against this partition, a large platform was raised, to which there was an ascent of six or eight steps, and upon this platform was the papal throne, opposite the steps which ascended to the corresponding platform of the altar. On the right the Prince Orsini stood, by the throne itself; in front of him, considerably towards the verge, the first cardinal-bishop sat; a cardinal-deacon sat on either side of the throne, and on the upper steps at either side the assistant-bishops stood or sat; below them, on one side, was the Roman magistracy; on the other, the judges and officers of the chief civil, criminal, and ecclesiastical tribunals. Below, on either side, the cardinals were ranged on elevated benches, and on lower ones at their feet, their train-bearers sat—nearer to the altar, the other members of the papal chapel were variously disposed, and from the lamps of the confession, on either side of the altar, back to the cardinals' benches, the guards of nobles in close single files filled up the space to prevent any intrusion. On benches behind the cardinals were archbishops and bishops not assistant, civil and military officers, the heads of religious orders, foreign ambassadors, and so forth.

After the Pope was seated, the cardinals, archbishops, bishops, and penitentiaries of St. Peters went successively to pay the usual homage, the first by kissing his right hand, the second by kissing his right knee, and the third by kissing his right foot. After this, the solemn intonation of the vespers was given by the holy father, and continued by the choir. The scene was sublime. The sensations were deep, solemn, and highly impressive.

After vespers, the Pallia were brought up from the tomb of the apostles, upon a salver covered with rich silk, and presented to the Pope to be blessed. Perhaps your readers do not know, and would wish to be informed, that a Pallium is a sort of woolen collar with five purple crosses on it, which is worn on solemn occasions by patriarchs, archbishops, and a few privileged bishops, and is emblematic of their right of presidency in their districts. The wool is shorn from lambs blessed on the festival of St. Agnes at her church outside the city; they are shorn at a particular time, and the wool spun and wove by the nuns of a particular convent under her invocation—the collars are then laid upon the tomb, in the confession of St. Peter, to signify the connexion of the bearer with his apostolical authority. They are brought and blessed at first vespers on June 28, and replaced upon the tomb until demanded for a new prelate, who,

upon receiving it, renews his oath of fealty to the Holy See, has it placed on his neck, wears it on solemn occasions, and has it buried with him. My paper is covered, I shall write soon again.

July 14th.—In my last I gave a brief description of the procession and first vespers of the festival of SS. Peter and Paul on the 28th ult. Preparations had been made for illuminating the exterior of the church of St. Peter, as soon as night should fall. No description can convey to your readers an adequate idea of the spectacle which this presents. The dome is somewhat larger than the church of St. Mary of the Martyrs, which is the old Pantheon; and this is not only surmounting the roof but raised considerably above it. This Pantheon is much larger than the circular church in Meeting Street. Imagine this as only one of three domes, of which it is, indeed, far the largest, elevated considerably above the roof of a church, the facade of which is a grand pile of architecture; this dome is half surrounded by columns, and the one by which the entablature over them is crowned, closely ribbed to its summit; over this is a ball, in which I was one of eight persons standing erect, and we had room for at least four others, and this ball surmounted by a cross. From the sides of the front two wings of splendid architecture project forward upwards of eighty feet; at their extremities are lofty columns, over which run the proper entablatures crowned by pediments; from these the immense colonnades recede almost semicircularly from each wing, sweeping, with their hundreds of pillars, round the immense piazza, capable of containing probably one hundred thousand human beings upon the area within their embrace. In the centre of this is a rich Egyptian obelisk resting upon the backs of four lions, *couchants* upon the angles of a fine pedestal. Half way from this obelisk, at each side towards the colonnade, are the two magnificent fountains, probably the most superb in the world. Each appears to be a capacious marble vase elevated upon a sufficiently strong, but gracefully delicate stem; the summit of this vase is at the elevation of about twelve feet. From its centre rises, to nearly the same height, another still more slender and delicately shaped stem, from whose summit is projected, to a considerable height, a water-spout which, gracefully bending near its summit and yielding to the direction of the wind, as it forms its curve and descent, is separated into a sort of sparkling spray of pearls and silver intermixed; about twelve other similar spouts shoot round this central liquid column, diverging from it on every side as they rise, and falling, with a similar appearance, at somewhat of a less elevation. They seem, in the distance, to be like rich

plumes of some gigantic ostrich waving gracefully in the breeze, whilst the descending shower is received in the capacious vase, from whose interior it is conducted to various fountains in the city. Hundreds of statues lift their various forms, appearing larger than life, over the frieze and cornice of the colonnade; whilst at the foot of the majestic flight of steps by which you ascend to the portico of the church, two ancient statues of St. Peter and St. Paul have for centuries rested upon their pedestals. The facade of the church itself is surmounted by the colossal statues of the twelve Apostles.

The illumination consisted of two parts. The lamps for the first part were disposed closely, in coloured paper, along the architectural lines of this mighty mass, along the ribs of the domes, around the ball, and on the cross.

To me, as I looked from the bridge of St. Angelo, the scene appeared like a vision of enchantment. It seemed as if a mighty pile of some rich, black, soft material was reared in the likeness of a stupendous temple, and the decorations were broad lines of burning liquid gold. The ball and the cross were seen as if detached and resting in the air above its summit. It was indeed a becoming emblem of the triumph of a crucified Redeemer over this terrestrial ball. After I had passed the bridge and as I approached the piazza, the front of the church and the expanse of the colonnade exhibited their lines of light. The specks which formed those lines glowed now more distinct and separate, and though their continuity was lost, their symmetry was perfect and magnificent. The immense piazza was thronged with carriages and persons on foot, whilst a division of the Papal dragoons, one of the finest and best disciplined bodies of cavalry in existence, moved in sections and single file through the multitude, calmly, but steadily and firmly, preserving order in a kind, polite, but determined manner. Scarcely a word is heard above a whisper; an accident is of so rare an occurrence as not to be calculated upon. The cardinal secretary of state has a gallery in front of the church, to which foreign ambassadors and a few other strangers of distinction are invited. I observed Captain Read and his lady in this gallery, and many of our officers were promenading below.

About an hour elapsed from the commencement, when the motion of a brighter light was observed towards the summit of the cupola, a large star seemed to shoot upwards to the cross, and, as if by a sudden flash from heaven, the whole edifice appeared to blaze in the glare of day. A thousand lights, kindled by some inconceivably rapid communication, shed their beams upon every part of the building. Pillars

and pilasters, with their vases, shafts, and capitals; mouldings, friezes, cornices, pediments, architraves, pannels, doors, windows, niches, images, decorations, enrichments, domes—all, all, with their faint lines of golden light, now softened to a milder lustre, revealed in brilliant relief to the enraptured eye. The fountains were magnificently grand, and richly pure, and softened into a refreshing white. The multitude was silent. The horses were still. The glowing cross, elevated above the Vatican hill, beamed to the wide plains and distant mountains, its augury of future glory because of past humiliation. The crowd began to move, the low buzz of conversation, and then the horses tramp, then followed the rattling of wheels. And whilst tens of thousands remained yet longer, other thousands moved in various directions to their homes, or to distant elevated points for the sake of a variety of views.

I went to the magnificent Piazza del Popolo. It was literally a desert—but in its stillness, and the dereliction of its obelisk, its fountains, and its statues, by the very contrast to the scene that I had left, there arose a feeling of new sublimity;—it was more deep—it was more solemn, but it was less elevated; not so overpowering, nor so impressive as that to which it succeeded. My object was to ascend from this place to the Monte Pincio:—the commanding view from which would enable me to look over the city at the great object which attracted every eye. But the gates of the avenue at this side were closed, and I had to go to the Piazza di Spagna, and there to ascend by the immense and beautiful flight of steps to the Trinità deì Monti; standing here in front of the convent of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, the view of St. Peter's was indeed superb. I proceeded up towards the public gardens lately formed on the summit of this ancient residence of so many of the remarkable men of five-and-twenty ages. At various intervals I stopped and turned to view the altered appearance presented by the mass of light as seen from those different positions. As I contemplated it I reflected that it must soon be extinguished like the transient glories of the philosophers, the heroes, the statesmen, the orators who successively passed over the spot on which I stood. A humble fisherman from Galilee, and an obscure tent maker from Tarsus, were confined in the dungeons of this city. Seventeen hundred and sixty-eight years had passed away since one of them was crucified with his head downwards, on the Vatican Hill, and the other was beheaded near the Ostian Way. They had been zealously faithful in discharging the duties of their apostleship. In the eyes of men their death was without honour, but it was precious in the

sight of God.—Grateful and admiring millions from year to year proclaim their praises, whilst the church exhibits their virtues as proofs of the power of the Saviour's grace, as models for the imitation of her sons. O! let my soul die [the death of] the just, and let my last end be like to theirs! Translated from this earth—they live in heaven! Tried for a time and found faithful, they enjoy a glorious recompense! The God that we serve is merciful in bestowing his grace, and is exceedingly bountiful in crowning his own gifts, by giving to us through the merits of his son a recompense for those acts of virtue which he enables us to perform!

I found myself again near the summit of the steps—I descended and retired to my home reflecting upon the wonders wrought by the Most High through the instrumentality of those two great saints, the celebration of whose festival had thus commenced. The ardent Peter, and the active Paul. The name changed to signify the office to which he should be raised. The Vicegerent of Heaven's King—bearing the mystic keys with powers of legislation and of administration, Whatever thou shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, whatsoever thou shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven. Yes!—upon this rock, was the church of the Saviour built—its principal weight of administration rested upon him, who of himself was weak, but who, converted and sustained by Christ, was strong. "Before the cock shall crow twice this night, thou shall thrice deny me. Yes! Satan hath desired to have thee that he might sift thee as wheat—but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not. And thou once converted, confirm thy brethren!" The strongest power that hell can muster in its gates, to make a furious assault upon that church, the weighty administration of which shall rest upon you, and upon those that shall succeed you, shall from time to time be marshalled and sent forth for the destruction of that body which the Saviour organized like a well-ordered kingdom upon earth for the attainment of heaven—but the gates of hell shall not prevail against it! The dynasties of nations have perished!—the palaces of the Cæsars are in ruins!—their tombs have mouldered with the bodies they contained, but the successors of Peter continue. Under the orders of Nero, the two apostles were consigned to what was imagined to be destruction. The vaults of the tryant's golden palace are covered with vegetation:—standing on the unseemly ruins of the remnant of this monster's monument, by the side of the Flaminian way, through the obscurity of the night, the Christian peasant looks towards that blaze of light, which, from the resting place where the relics of the head of

the church and of the Doctor of the Gentiles are found, breaks forth and irradiates the eternal city, and its monumental environs.

If Peter is elevated in station, Paul is not less glorious in merit. He, too, looked back with sorrow on that day when he held the clothes of those who slew Stephen. But how nobly did he redeem his error? —A vessel of election to bear the good odour of Christ into the palaces of kings!—a torrent of eloquence flowing into the barren fields of a vain philosophy to fertilize and adorn! A rich exhibition of virtue, winning by its beauty, attracting by its symmetry, and exciting to activity by emulation. A glowing meteor of benediction, dissipating the clouds of error, shedding the lustre of truth around, and warming the hearts of the beholders to charity on earth, that they might be fitted for glory in heaven.

July 17th.—On the 30th of June, a chapel of the bishops assistant at the throne, was held at the Church of St. Paul, on the Ostian road. This is the great basilic which was consumed by fire about eleven years ago. In this conflagration the great altar and the place where the relics of the Apostles repose escaped. Hundreds of workmen continue to be employed in the restoration of this fine church, and considerable progress has been made. The transept is covered in, the columns of the aisles are erected, and most of them have their capitals mounted—the shafts are a beautiful iron gray granite, each shaft one piece of upwards of twenty feet in height, and the cap a fine white marble, Corinthian or composite, each in two blocks—very few are Ionic. The aisles of this church are new as far as the transept. The floor is to be raised three feet above its old level, as on some former occasions the Tiber rose to such a height, as to overflow it. Probably twenty years more, at least, must pass away, before this church can be used, though probably five hundred men are continually employed in its works. The offices are at present performed in three chapels which are the old sacristies—and would make moderate sized American churches.

On this day also two of the cardinal-bishops consecrated each two of the newly appointed bishops of whose nomination I sent you an account. But on the subsequent Sunday, I was present at a ceremony which to me was quite new—the consecration of a Catholic bishop according to the Greek rite. It took place in the Greek Church, in the Via del Babuino, and was rather thinly attended, as it was not generally known. I do not believe that there were 500 persons in the church. The prelate consecrated was Gabriel Smicsitilaszbi Crisio—the consecating prelate was the Most Reverend Basil Tomaggiani, a native of

Pera, of Constantinople, born in the year 1762, a minor conventual friar and Archbishop of Durazzo—who for a number of years resides in this city, for the purpose of performing the episcopal functions of the Greek rite. He was assisted by two Latin doctors, Lewis Cardelli, a minor reformed friar, Archbishop of Acrida, *in partibus,* and Lewis Grati, a Servite (formerly Archbishop of Smyrna, which he resigned) friar, Bishop of Gallimicio, *in partibus.* The deacon was the same that sung the Gospel in Greek, at St. Peter's, at the Papal High Mass on the festival of SS. Peter and Paul, the sub-deacon was from the Propaganda. Several other students from this college also attended to sing the other parts of the service according to their rite. An American bishop and an American priest in plain official dress, not vestments, and a few other clergymen of various orders were permitted to go within the partition which separate the Greek altars from the congregation. Small as the number present was, the persons composing it were collected from many nations, and though all of one faith, yet followed several rites.

The ceremony as regards vesture, instruments, and form, was far more simple than the Latin rite. The consecrating prelate only laid one hand on the head of the person consecrated, the assisting prelate however held the book of the Gospels on his shoulders during the imposition. The crosier is altogether of a different form from that used by the Latins. It is shorter, more slender, and in place of a crook, has a double curve, as if two serpents had their tails inserted in the top of the shaft, and their bodies stretched horizontally in opposite directions, for about six inches each, after which they turn upwards bending their heads towards each other so as to approach within a couple of inches. This is given to the person to be consecrated, when he is made a doctor, immediately after his profession of faith and oath of fealty previous to the Mass. No unction of either the head or hand is used, nor is any mitre placed on his head. He, on the proper occasions after his consecration, takes the Greek mitre, which is very different in its shape from that of the Latins, being in fact a crown. Upon the whole the ceremony was very interesting, though by no means so solemn or imposing as that of the Latins. On the same day, (July 6,) Cardinal Odescalchi, Vice-Chancellor of the holy Roman Church, and Bishop of Sabina, went in state to the church of St. Andrew on the Quirinal hill, the novitiate of the Jesuits, and consecrated the Right Reverend Francis Strani, Bishop of the diocess of Massa di Carrara, the assistants were the Most Reverend John Soglia, Archbishop of Ephesus, and the Most Reverend Constantine Patozzi, Archbishop of Philippi and major-domo to His Holiness.

All the Italian bishops are consecrated in this city by cardinals, though the pontifical directs that as far as possible the bishop should be consecrated in the midst of his own people, in the church to which he is promoted. The custom here originated in the practice very properly established, that previously to being approved and nominated by His Holiness in the consistory, the bishops elect of these countries shall be examined in theology and canon law, and certified as perfect in their knowledge of both, by a very respectable congregation of cardinals, prelates, theologians, and jurists. I recollect that one of the most learned of this body of examiners, the present Bishop of Orvietto, having been appointed by the Pope, from his personal knowledge of his learning and merit, could not obtain the necessary certificate from his brother examiners, without undergoing a very rigorous and searching trial. When thus in the holy city, and examined, approved, and named, they generally preferred being consecrated by a cardinal-bishop, and the custom is now grown into a law. I must acknowledge that I prefer the discipline laid down in the pontifical.

As your readers might wish to see a list of this congregation, and thus have an idea of the constitution of those committees of business—I shall give you a list of the present congregation for the examination of bishops elect.

Examiners in Theology.

Cardinals:—1. Pacca. 2. Zurla. 3. Micara. 4. Lambruschini. 5. Marco-y-Catalan.

Fathers:—6. Master Dominic Buttaoni, a Dominican friar, Master of the Sacred Palace. 7. Master Thomas Antonino Degola, of the same order, Secretary of the Index. 8. John da Capistrano, ex-General minister of the reformed minor Observantine friars. 9. Lewis Togni, prefect-general of the fathers infirmarians for the charitable care of the sick. 10. Laurence da Camerata, of the order of friars capuchins, apostolic preacher for the papal household. 11. The Abbate Paul del Signore, a canon regular of St. Saviour's of Lateran. 12. John Roothan, general of the society of Jesus. 13. The Abbate Don Ambrose Bianchi, vicar-general of the Benedictine congregation of Camaldoli. 14. Cherubino da Arienzo, of the order of friars minors, observantines. 15. Master Laurence Tardi, vicar-general of the order of Hermits of St. Augustine. 16. Don Emilio Jacopini, of the order of regular minor clerks.

Examiners in Canon Law

Cardinals:—1. Galleffii. 2. De Gregorio. 3. Falzacappa. 4. Odescalchi. 5. Fransoni. 6. Sala.

Most Reverend:—7. Joseph della Porta Ronciglione, Patriarch of Constantinople. 8. Francis Canali, lately created cardinal, Archbishop of Larissa. 9. John Soglia, Archbishop of Ephesus.

The Prelates:—Reverend Jerome Bontadosi, auditor (or assessor) of His Holiness. Silvester Bargagnati, one of the clerks of the chamber, (court of appeals.) Reverend Joseph Mezzofanti, first keeper of the Vatican library, of whom Lord Byron had so high an opinion; probably one of the first linguists in existence: he speaks with facility thirty-four living languages, and several of the dead tongues.

Secretary:—The Most Reverend Joseph Vespigniani, Archbishop of Tyana.

When I contemplated one of those congregations, and after taking each individual separately and considering his erudition and respectability upon a variety of other grounds, and then viewed the aggregate of their merits:—how did I pity the little beings who, without knowing one particle of the mode in which business is done here, or concerning the character or qualifications of the councillors of the holy father, write and speak of mankind, ignorance, the dark ages, the mariner's compass, the art of printing, the feudal times—Martin Luther, Henry VIII., Anne Boleyn, and so forth.

By the by, as we have touched this chord—I amused some of our Americans, whilst they were in this city about three weeks since, by taking them to Monsignor Mezzofanti, with whom I have the happiness of an intimate acquaintance, and procuring from him one of the pieces in his archives, an autograph love letter of the gallant monarch to Miss Anne. It is written in French, and not easily legible at the first inspection; in the flourish to his signature is a heart in the midst of which upon examination, you find the initials of the lady's name A. This letter is pasted on the leaf of a book which contains a copy of the piece in a more modern and legible hand, by the aid of which the original is easily deciphered. Some ladies who joined the American party examined it with considerable minuteness; his majesty did not seem to be in the beheading humour when it was written? The learned keeper produced another piece of whose authenticity there could be no question. The copy of Henry's work in defence of the Catholic doctrine, of the seven sacraments, against Martin Luther, which work procured for his majesty so many polite compliments from the sainted reformers and for him and his successors from the holy See, the title of "Defender of the Faith"—which title those successors have with such admirably good taste preserved, whilst they robbed, whipped, banished, hanged, quartered, embowelled, and beheaded their beloved subjects for

believing as his majesty then wrote!! The dedication of this work to his holiness, was subscribed by his majesty with his own royal hand, and the work has been preserved ever since with care in the archives of the holy city. Monsignor Mezzofanti requested of the ladies to compare the signatures, which were palpably the work of the same hand. He was requested by them very naturally to give the history of the way in which the lady's letter came into the Vatican, which he did to our satisfaction—but as I am so stupid, the chain of succession has got entangled in my memory, and I shall not just now venture to guess. Probably, if nothing more important banishes the determination, I shall ask my friend for the history, when next we meet, and shall try to recollect it for you then.

I shall now give you an outline of the career of one of the cardinal-deacons, who died on the 8th of this month, at the advanced age of nearly 83 years. Your readers are aware that the whole body of the cardinals are not devoted solely to ecclesiastical affairs—as they are also the senate for the temporal government of the states of the church; and generally the principal duties of the cardinal-deacons regard this business.

Antonino Maria Frosini, born in Modena, September 8th, 1751, of Alexander, Marquis Frosini, principal major-domo of the Ducal Court, and aulic counsellor of the German Empire, and Victoria, Countess of Carandini, was educated in the Royal College of St. Charles, where he graduated in 1771, his father died two years afterwards. Young Frosini soon received the appointment of chamberlain, and at a much earlier age than usual, by reason of his conduct and talents, he was promoted to the rank of brigadier, and sent by the Grand Duke Francis III., as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to the imperial court of Vienna; where he discharged the duties of his office, during a portion of the reigns of Maria Theresa and of Joseph II., with full satisfaction to all parties. Retiring from the Court of Modena, he, in 1783, attached himself to that of Rome, and obtained from Pius VI. a judicial place in the prelature of justice, and as referendary of both signatures, (grace and justice,) and was successively Governor of Montalto, Spoleto, Ancona, and Vecchia, in all of which he gave satisfaction. In 1798, he was obliged to retire to Florence, by the French. He attended as prelate when the conclave sat in Venice, for the election of Pius VII., in 1800. Returning to Rome, he was in the September of that year promoted to a seat on the supreme tribunal of Justice. In 1808, again the French invasions obliged him to fly to Florence, where he had considerable estates; but in 1810, he was obliged to go thence to

Paris. In 1814, he went to England, and towards the close of the year returned to Rome, where he now had the second place upon his bench. In 1816, he became a prelate of the Camera or Exchequer, and president of a special commission for encouraging the cultivation of rice in the districts of Ferrara and Bologna, and the regulation of the water-works of St. George, in the vallies of Comacchio, which duties he fulfilled with great credit. On October 1, 1817, Pius VII, appointed him his majordomo, and in the Secret Consistory of March 10, 1823, he was made a cardinal-deacon, with the title of St. Mary, in Cosmedin, and he gave this church many rich presents. His eminence was made a member of the congregations of apostolic visitation, of the council, of indulgences, and holy relics, of waters and taxes. Leo XII. placed him also on the congregation of economy, and upon the vacancy, made him prefect of the congregation of indulgences and holy relics: the present Pope placed him on the congregation of sacred rites. He was in the conclaves that elected Leo XII., Pius VIII., and Gregory XVI. For some time he had been delicate and declining in health. His piety was very fervid and well regulated, his charities very extensive and unostentatious, his discharge of magisterial duties, enlightened, firm, and impartial. On the 18th of June, he had an access of fever—and began more particularly his preparations for another world,—receiving the last sacraments with edifying devotion, and placing his confidence in the merits of his Saviour, he calmly died, on the evening of the eighth inst., aged 82 years, 10 months. His obsequies were performed with the usual solemnities.

July 25.—This is the period when the examinations are made in all the schools and colleges of this city. I do not know exactly the number of students, but I am perhaps considerably under the mark in saying they are something over two thousand. On Thursday, the 17th, I attended at the defence of his theses, by an American student at the Urban college, generally known as that of the Propaganda. The number of young men in this institution is over one hundred.

The process is generally as follows: during the private examinations at the several periods of the year, by the professors of the college itself, and also at that towards the end of the academical season, by others as well as by the professors of the house, one or more of the best pupils are selected to defend the thesis. A thesis, as your readers are aware, is a position or stated proposition; several of these are selected from the scientific course, which the student publishes and declares that he will be ready, at a fixed time and place, to defend their

truth against all opponents. The lists are regularly prepared for this scholastic knight, who appears duly sustained to exhibit his powers: nor is this tournament a mere idle display, in the rivalry of the schools; there are often formidable encounters and numerous spectators, and not unfrequently serious disasters. There is a formidable Jesuit here, who is a professor of dogmatic theology at the Roman college, who has lately swept, in a comparatively short encounter, half a dozen of those youthful aspirants from the field of fame; and their teachers were neither insensible nor inactive on and after the encounter. The effects of this carnage are not yet at an end; gauntlet after gauntlet is flung down, and the judges of such feats are in continual requisition.

On the present occasion, John Martin Spalding, a Kentuckian, and the senior student of the United States of North America, a pupil of the Urban college, published a respectful and manly Latin address to the congregation of cardinals presiding over the affairs of the Propaganda, in which, after wishing their eminences happiness and health, he informs them of what he considers the blessings diffused by their institution, for which they deserve thanks; and as he has finished the usual course of studies, he has determined to express publicly his gratitude by sustaining his theses, expressing the doctrines which he shall endeavour to teach in those distant regions to which he is about to return. For this purpose he will appear, God willing, in the morning, in the great hall of the college, when and where it shall be lawful for any one who thinks proper to controvert what he undertakes to defend; and in the afternoon he will appear in the college chapel, where three select champions will successively make their assaults, after which he will be ready to meet any other that might be disposed to try his strength.

Then follow a list of two hundred and fifty-six propositions which he undertakes to defend; they are taken from the several treatises of theology and canon law; copies of this were sent to the other colleges, and special invitations were given to several individuals whose attendance was particularly desirable.

About half past eight o'clock on Thursday morning, I arrived at the gate of the college, on the pavement in front of which was a profuse scattering of sweet-smelling green leaves; the bay and myrtle predominated; the gate itself was open, and this fragrant path marked the way to the interior. The strewing continued up the great staircase, along the open gallery of the first floor, to the great door leading to the principal corridor, along this passage to the gate of the principal hall. This room, about eighty feet in length, by perhaps forty wide, and twenty in height, has its walls decorated with paintings of students of

this college, under the inflictions of the deadly pain by which they were in remote regions martyred for their discharge of duty; thus exhibiting to the youth who are therein educated, the constancy which the church expects from them under similar circumstances. At the further extremity, opposite the door, was a carpeted platform elevated two steps; upon this the young Kentuckian was seated, with a small table before him, having also seated by him, on one side, his professor of theology, a Roman, and on the other his professor of law, a Bavarian count, who is a priest and rector of the college. The renowned scholar, Angelo Mai, presided, being seated on your right, as you entered the hall near this platform. A range of chairs extended on either side, leaving a passage of about ten feet wide in the centre, from the door to the platform. Those chairs were intended for cardinals, bishops, or other prelates and professors who might arrive; ranges of benches parallel to these, on each side, behind, were pretty generally thronged by students of that and of other colleges, and by many strangers. No cardinal was present in the forenoon; the Bishop of Charleston was the only prelate of the episcopal order; but several others of various grades, secular and regular, amongst whom were the rectors and professors of several colleges, occupied most of the chairs.

The first argument had been concluded when I arrived; it was conducted by an Italian secular priest, whose name I could not learn; the second was made by a Dominican friar, a man of very great talent and ingenuity: he had also nearly concluded. An infirmarian, or crutched friar, conducted the third with considerable spirit and ability. By the by, you should in America say, that what I call a crutched friar, is in Italy called a *crucifero,* or "cross-bearer." He wears a red cross on the right breast of a black habit, and his obligation is to spend his time in attending the sick, especially in infirmaries. Hence I call him an infirmarian: this valuable order of devoted men was founded by St. Camillo of Lellis. Next succeeded an Irishman, a student of the Roman seminary, who did argue most lustily against the real presence, and sacrifice of the Mass. The next was a German Jesuit, well known in the United States, Father Kohlmann, who for nearly half an hour argued eloquently against the primacy of the Holy See; he was followed by Signor Rosa, one of the minutanti, and a professor of theology, who argued against the power of remitting all sins in the sacrament of penance. Doctor Wiseman, rector of the English college, next argued for the figurative meaning of the words of our Saviour, in the institution of the Eucharist, introducing various analogous passages from Persian, Arabic, and other Asiatic writers, some of which are pompously

brought forward in the preface to ponderous tomes of polyglots, by an Oxford doctor of modern celebrity. The celebrated Monsignor Mezzofanti, then followed up with considerable subtlety and acuteness, when the great bell announced midday.

The young American had now been upwards of four hours sharply engaged in scholastic disputation, in the Latin language, with men of various nations and of no ordinary calibre, and had not failed or hesitated in a single answer.

To a stranger the style of this mode of disputation is altogether a novelty. You are carried back by the introduction of the argument to all the pompous style of ancient heraldry, and regulated courtesy of disputation. The disputant generally commences by a high wrought compliment to the institution, to its various officers, to the particular professor of the science in which he is to make his assault, to the genius and erudition of the defender; then speaks of his own defeats, how reluctant he is to couch a lance against so powerful an opponent, but if he makes a pass or two, it is not in the vain hope of a victory for which there is no chance, but that, taught by the prowess he will elicit, he may improve. He then commences his attack and presses on, generally with great vigour. The defender in turn professes the high estimation in which he holds his opponent; introducing in his description an enumeration of the offices he has held, the honours he had obtained, and the great qualities for which he is remarkable. Then he briefly recapitulates the argument, dissects it, and takes its separate parts for successive examination, and after having thus disposed of it, he says that he is disposed to think it not so strong as at first supposed.

There was a recess for rest, dinner, and preparation for the afternoon. But on this occasion the assembly was more solemn. The disposition of the church was similar to that of the hall. The dresses, however, on this occasion were, for cardinals, bishops, and other prelates, what were called robes of the second class. The cardinals in red, the bishops in purple, and such of the other prelates as were entitled to it the same colour. The cardinals, of whom only seven were present, sat on very rich chairs on the right side of the chapel, you faced the door, those chairs were elevated one step above the level of the floor. Three chosen disputants occupied the first places on the opposite side, then the bishops, and so forth. The Swiss Guards formed at the door and lined the passage. The exercises began with an exceedingly ingenious argument against the Primacy of St. Peter, made with great tact and skill by the prelate Raffaelle Fornari, Canonist of the Penitentiary, former Professor of Theology in the Propaganda, and a man of the very first

ability. This lasted nearly three quarters of an hour. The second was on the subject of Grace, by Father Perrone, a Jesuit, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the Roman College; this is a man of the most profound research and great logical powers, with an admirable memory. This engagement lasted half an hour. Nearly as long again was occupied in an argument against the divine character of Christianity, by Father Modena, Assistant to the Master of the Sacred Palace, and a Dominican friar. The cardinals rose and shook hands with the Kentuckian, who was carried away by his fellow-students in triumph.

Thus ended the public disputation at about eight o'clock. This is a specimen of Roman schools, and monkish ignorance!

August 2.—Yesterday a secret consistory was held at the Quirinal Palace, at which His Holiness closed the mouths of the new Cardinals Tiberi, Canali, Botiglia, and Polidori. Subsequently he opened their mouths and assigned their titles, viz.:—Tiberi, Cardinal-Priest of Santo Stefano Rontodo; Canali, Cardinal-Priest of St. Clement; Botiglia, Cardinal-Priest of St. Sylvester in Capite; and Polidori, Cardinal-Priest of St. Eusebius.

On last Monday, the 29th of July, the Society of the Arcadi held, according to custom, their solemn meeting at the capital, in honour of the Apostles SS. Peter and Paul; Cardinal Grignola opened the session by an oration, in which he showed, in a beautiful and simple style, how accordant with the wisdom of God's providence was the arrangement that both those glorious Apostles should be heralds of divine faith in this city. The first was given the supremacy over the Apostolic College; the second was dignified with the glorious title of Doctor of the Gentiles, and both were directed to this spot which rose as a queen over the nations, and which was destined to become the chief seat of religious authority, as it had been of civil power and military domination, to this spot, which was the chief point at which the learning, the superstition, and the might of the gentile world was congregated. The discourse was received with merited applause.

A number of the associates succeeded with various compositions. Amongst them were, a poem of the prelate Vincent Massoni; an elegiac production of Father Theodore, a barefooted Carmelite; an ode of the lawyer John Baptist de Dominis; an essay of Mr. Francis Masi; an ode of Mr. Francis Spada; a Latin poetical effusion of the prelate Serafino Grossi, Dean of the Signature, with a translation by Signora Enrichetta Orfei, and an octave by the eminent preacher Father Finetti, of the Jesuits. Various sonnets and odes by different other members were

interspersed. Cardinals Odescalchi, Zurla, Maichi, Sala, Castracane, Rivarola, Gazzoli and Grimaldi, besides a very considerable number of prelates and other distinguished personages were present on the occasion.

The celebrated historical painter Cavaliere Agostino Tofanelli, who was director of the museum of the capital, died of apoplexy on the 31st ult., in the sixty-fourth year of his age.

A considerable number of wealthy persons, principally French Carlists, have projected the plan of a national bank here, to be called the Banca Romana. The government approved their plan and authorized its execution. The shares have been very readily taken up, and things are in progress for its commencing business. Within the last week Prince Odescalchi has been named the government commissioner, and the Marquis de Jouffroy, elected by the shareholders as president, has been approved of by the government and received the proper documents.

A view of the interior of the church of St. Peter at the Vatican has been finished, after close application of two years and a half, by Signor Philip Bombelli, who was employed for this purpose by the holy father, soon after his elevation to the pontifical throne. It is now in one of the antechambers of the Quirinal palace at Monte Cavallo, where the Pope resides. It is much spoken of as a very fine production, and is to be placed in one of the principal rooms of that palace. I have not seen it as yet, but I hope in a few days to have leisure for that visit.

His Holiness has now employed Bombelli to make a painting of the church of St. Paul on the Ostian road, such as it was previous to the ruinous fire by which it was destroyed.

By the by, there is considerable progress made towards the restoration of this edifice.

I was this day at the villa occupied by Prince Musignano, son of Lucien Bonaparte, Prince of Canino—near the Porta Pia—and there met the prince, who went with me through the three rooms which form his splendid collection of birds, insects, fish, and some of the smaller animals. It is in the finest state of preservation. The collection of birds is probably one of the most perfect in existence. The American specimens numerous and beautiful, several of them shot by himself.

Besides having completed Wilson's work, he is now deeply engaged in the study of nature, and has already made considerable progress in the numbers of a very excellent work, the pictures of which are splendid, and yet I am sorry to say that he told me he had not above five or six subscribers in the United States; not one at the South!!

I must send you a list of the cardinals and congregations. I have

often determined to do so, but procrastinated—day by day changes occur. I do not recollect whether I sent you an account of the death of Cardinal Antonio Palotta. You observe his title of St. Sylvestro in Capite has not been long vacant, yet there are at present fourteen vacant titles, but there are seven cardinals *in petto,* so that in fact there are only seven vacancies in the college. The six bishoprics are full. There are forty-one presbyterial titles full and nine vacant, nine diaconal titles full and five vacant.

July 26, Learned Societies:—The charge of monkish ignorance, with all its unmeaning concomitants, comes against this city with a very bad grace from places, where as yet comparatively little has been done to promote or to sustain a literary spirit. It is true Rome had her days of light, flimsy, gossamer-like semblance of science; she had also her day of melancholy oppression. She has had the peace of her children destroyed by the turmoil of faction; she has had to weep over the fury of her sons, and to mingle her tears with the torrents of their blood, not shed in the defence of public rights, but for the purposes of ambition. Religion often restrained and soothed the desperado; but religion herself was sometimes trodden down, and bruised, and wounded in the unholy affrays produced by the lust of power. In those days the din of confusion distracted even the monk in his cloister; and closing the pages, or rolling up the parchment, he wept and prayed before the altar; or if he came out, it was to make an effort for peace, it was to cast himself between the exasperated victor and his prostrate victim; to lift the emblematic crucifix by which the God of mercy and the Judge of men admonished the one, and to fling the protecting mantle of religion over the other. The day of tumult, the arena of faction, the intrigues of ambition, the contests of violence, are not favourable to the pursuits of literature. And in this holy city, as in all other places, human passions are found in human beings. Rome has had her vicissitudes. Yet may she look around in calm dignity, and with the roll of ages unfolded, and the surface of the globe exhibited to the beholders, firmly ask where is her rival. The number of literary and scientific societies at present not merely in existence, but in operation here, exceeds that of any other city that I know, or perhaps that is known. Instead of a general description, I shall give you a few details; and those probably not one-fourth of what might be collected within the same period, as I was occupied in such a way as to leave me little leisure. . . . The Academy of the Catholic Religion held one of its stated meetings on the evening of Thursday, April 24. The president of this acade-

my is the Most Reverend Doctor John Soglia, Archbishop of Ephesus; the secretary *ad interim* is the Reverend Father John Baptist Rosani, Procurator-General of the Regular Clerks for Pious Schools. The Academy consists of a large number of highly talented and erudite clergymen and laymen, and they have a very respectable body of honorary members in various parts of the world. The object is to make those literary researches which are demanded by the peculiar circumstances of the times, for the illustration and support of the Catholic religion. They meet in a large hall at the Roman University, generally called the Sapienza. On this evening, Father Olivieri, General of the Dominican friars, read an extremely interesting and erudite essay, to prove that, without a knowledge of Sacred Scriptures, it was utterly impossible to have any accurate notions of either the antiquities or the history of Egypt. The substance of the composition is given in the following outline. Some well-deserved compliments to the exertions of the learned academician, Monsignor Testa, for his famous dissertation, by which was demonstrated the correct epoch of the zodiac of Denderah, that by some exquisites is thrown back to ages before the flood, and by others to ages before the creation,—he then remarked upon the value of those Egyptian monuments, which, whatever might be the object of those that sought and produced them, gave, by their own authentic symbols and explanations, results always favourable to the cause of religion. Upon this principle he considered Egypt as connected with the great facts of sacred history; he enumerated the several kinds of antiquities remaining to us. A vast collection is found in the galleries of the Vatican, and some in other parts of the city. He showed the aids furnished by profane erudition, especially from the catalogues of monarchs of the Egyptian dynasties; he proved that, without the help of the sacred volumes, it is impossible to make any reasonable distribution of those numbers. According to the chronology which approximates most to the Hebrew copies considered as most to be relied upon, and to the Latin Vulgate, it is impossible to go beyond Cham, the son of Noe; the journeys of Abraham, and his sojourn in Egypt exhibit, as does all the history of that period, the infancy of political institutions in that country, the great monuments of which cannot precede the time of Joseph, the great-grandson of Abraham, under whose administration the power and grandeur of the Egyptian monarchs had their origin. Finally, the learned academician demonstrated, with evidence, that the arts and sciences had no earlier origin than the days of his administration in that country, which was one of the most precocious of Africa, and equal, perhaps, to any in Asia. He showed that, previous to the

deluge, considerable progress had been made in many of the arts that flourished in ancient Egypt; and that a mighty process of time would not be required for the attainment of such a grade of knowledge, seeing that God had created man in a state of adult vigour, endowed with language for the communication of ideas, and with information necessary not only for the preservation of life, but for father of future generations. The meeting was numerous; amongst those present were the Cardinals Pedicini, Zurla, and Lambruschini, ordinary canons of the Academy; several archbishops, bishops, distinguished prelates, nobles, and literary men of various ranks.

Archæological Academy, or Pontificia Academia Romana di V. Acheologia.—This is a very highly respectable society, which hold its meetings in the great hall of the Roman Archiginnasio. Its object is the illustration of ancient monuments, and especially the correction of any popular errors respecting those generally best known. Protector, Cardinal Galleffi; President, the Marquis Commander Louis Biondi; Secretary, the Cavaliere Peter Hercules Visconti. In such a city as Rome, a society of this description is most useful. The number of ancient Pagan monuments that line the wall on your right, as you enter by the long passage to the galleries and chambers of statues in the Vatican,—the corresponding monuments of early Christianity on your left,—the succession of Egyptian monuments in the various chambers by which you pass to that which contains the fine painting of George IV. of England by Sir Thomas Lawrence, and the casts of the Grecian marble, not to speak of the vast quantities daily produced from the excavations, would well employ many learned antiquarians.

A stated meeting was held on the 12th of June, under the presidency of the Marquis Biondi; the Academician Cavaliere T. Monaldi pronounced the eulogy of Domenico Sestina, a noble Florentine, deeply learned in the knowledge of medals, and a corresponding member of the Academy. The secretary then produced an ancient Italian vase, considerably adorned with figures, and which was found in the month of last December in the excavations near Bolsena, and which now belongs to the collection of Signor Campanari, in this city. The learned secretary showed that it contained amongst others the representations of the last libation made by Hector on parting from Priam and Hecuba previous to encountering Achilles. He thence took occasion to discuss the origin of the Italian arts, and of the poets who inspired the artists, vindicating in arts for Italy a priority over Greece. There were present on the occasion, Cardinals Zurla, Sala, Castracane, Gazzoli, Mattei, and Grimaldi, all honorary members. His eminence Cardinal James

Monico, Patriarch of Venice, was on this occasion admitted to honorary membership.

Another meeting of this society was held on the evening of the 26th of June, on which occasion the secretary continued the reading of a dissertation of which he had given a portion at a previous meeting. It was by the corresponding member and associate Cavaliere Prockesch d'Osten on the antiquities of the Island of Naxos. Then an illustration was given of a military diploma of the Emperor Adrian, now first brought to view. It was written by the corresponding member and associate Signor Clement Cardinali. At this meeting there were present the Cardinals Zurla, Sala, and Grimaldi, honorary members, besides many others of high respectability.

On the 19th of June, there was another meeting of the Academy of the Catholic Religion, on which occasion the Reverend Secretary read a very fine essay of the academician, Cavaliere Angelo Maria Ricci, a Knight of Malta and an excellent poet, "On the influence which the Catholic religion has always had on the progress of literature and the fine arts." The best judges of style gave high praises to this composition, for its perspicuity, elegance, varying harmony with the varying tone of the subject, and a simple sweetness of delicate, natural expression. Since Charles Villers obtained the prize from the national institute of France in 1802, for his essay to show that the religious changes made by Luther improved literature and the arts; it has to a certain extent been fashionable to copy, to imitate, or to emulate his effort. The academician reviewed the allegations of a whole host of those gentry, showing upon how flimsy a foundation they rested, going from age to age of previous centuries to exhibit that before the bold professor of Wittemberg ventured upon the defence of the first thesis, the arts and sciences had attained and lost, and again attained, again lost many of those accidental improvements which were with so little reason attributed to his innovations. The principles and powers of sound criticism were here well applied.

It was demonstrated in the fulness of evidence, that in the dark days of a desolating barbarism, which anti-Christian hordes spread over the civilized countries of Europe, the fine arts, science and literature owed their asylum to popes, bishops, and monks, who preserved, cultivated, cherished, and restored them, when by their indefatigable and protracted exertions, those ferocious conquerors were softened unto humanity, subjected to religion, and brought unto the porch of civilization; that as society thus reformed, was advancing towards perfection, these ennobling appendages were also receiving their development.

The essayist then proceeded by analysis, by comparison, and by examples to show how much the spirit of the Catholic religion, and the purity of its morality contributed to render more sublime and perfect the conceptions of the poet, of the philosopher, and of the artist.

The meeting was attended by Cardinals Castracane and Grimaldi, by the Archbishop of Acrida, and by many distinguished prelates, nobles, clergy, and other literary characters.

Insigne Pontificia Academia Romana di San Luca:—The object of the Academy of St. Luke is the encouragement, improvement, and cultivation of the fine arts. Its officers are—President, Cavaliere Gaspare Salvi; Vice-President, Professor Thomas Minardi; Ex-President, Cavaliere Antonio D'Estre; Secretary of the Council, Professor Louis Poletti; Steward, Clement Caval Folchi; Perpetual Secretary of the Academy, Professor Salvatore Batti.

In the schools, there are the following professorships, viz.:—Painting, two, Pozzi, and Minardi; Sculpture, two, Thorwaldsen and Tenerani; Theory of Architecture, Gaspare Salvi; Practical Architecture, Valadier; Elementary and Ornamental Architecture, Julius Camporesa; Geometry, Perspective, and Optics, Peter Delicati; Anatomy, Cajetan Albites; History, Mythology, and Dress, Salvatore Batti. Besides the above who are in actual employment, there are belonging to the society resident professors of merit, that is, men whose professional merits duly ascertained, have entitled them to be enrolled; of them there are of the several classes, the following numbers:—Class of Painting—Councillors, 8; Academicians of merit, 4; Landscapes, 4; Engravers of copper-plate, 2. Every name here is that of a man high in fame. Class of Sculpture—Councillors, 8; Academicians of merit, 4; Engravers in steel and hard stone, 3. Class of Architecture—Councillors, 8; Academicians of merit, 4. This is a first rate institution. The schools, all of which are supported by the Pope, and the lectures in which are gratuitous, are held in the Roman University or Archiginnasio.

At a meeting of this academy on the 6th of this month, the president in the chair, he spoke upon several topics, but particularly of a receipt, dated June 28th, by which he assigns a rich uniform dress, to be worn on state occasions by the professors of merit of this institute. It reckons amongst its honorary members several of the first names amongst the distinguished men of various nations, eminent patrons of the fine arts or cultivators of sciences connected therewith.

Union of Academies:—On the 30th of June, by a joint regulation of both the Archæological Academy and that of St. Luke, they held their yearly joint assembly; on this occasion the great hall was decorated with

peculiar splendour. His eminence, Cardinal Dom Placido Zurla, Vicar-General of Rome, Prefect of the Council of Studies, a Benedictine monk of the congregation of Camaldoli, and probably one of the most polished scholars and most eloquent men in Europe, was the orator. His theme was the influence of religion on the fine arts. He dwelt principally on the sublime group of Canova in the chapel of the Pietà at St. Peter's, as well as on the other splendid productions by means of which genius consigned the fame of the artist to the care of immortality. Canova was president of both the societies. The close logical reasoning, the glowing and distinct illustrations and the expanded philosophical reflections which flowed in such strong and harmonious language from this eminent, good, and extraordinarily active man, now in the 66th year of his age, delighted his auditory, and drew forth repeated bursts of applause. Amongst those present were noticed, the Cardinal Camerlengo Galleffi, protector of both societies. Cardinals Macchi, Lambruschini, Sala, Castracane, Monico, Polidori, Rivarola, Gazzoli, Mattei, and Grimaldi. The treasurer, Tosti, better known as the president of the fine establishment of San Michele, and a very large body of prelates, nobility, and literary men, and patrons of the arts, most of whom, as are all above named, were honorary members of one or both academies. It was thought by some that the Pope would attend to compliment the orator, who is his confessor, and formerly was his superior, as they are monks of the same order, but His Holiness was not present.

I had noted several others which I must postpone, as my paper is filled. Cardinal Palotta died near Macerta on the 20th inst., in the 65th year of his age; created in March, 1823.

July 28, Literary Societies, and so forth:—In my last I gave a few facts respecting the Archæological Academy, the Academy of the Catholic Religion, and the Academy of St. Luke. I promised a few farther details.

On the afternoon of the 6th of July, the Tiberine Academy held a stated meeting at its hall in the Palazzo Muti, at Aracœli, near the capitol. President, Charles, Marquis Antichi. Secretary, the lawyer John Baptist de Dominis. The object is the cultivation of polite literature; occasionally, or rather as incidentally connected with the principal object, antiquities. I believe this academy has public meetings every week for a considerable portion of the year. Their president is elected annually. This meeting was one of what is called "*di libero argomento,*" which gives greater scope to the academicians to introduce any species of composition.

On the evening of the 6th, the president began by reading a production of his own, exceedingly well written, pointing out the principles and regulations by whose means the theatre might, without difficulty, be made truly profitable, as an institution for public instruction as well as public amusement. He was followed by the vice-president of this year; the Reverend Father, Master John Baptist Rosani, procurator-general of the pious schools and professor of eloquence in the Nazarene college. This learned and respectable clergyman, read what was called a very fine piece of heroic poetry composed by him for the occasion; but I could not well understand the subject. The learned and polished scholar, Cavaliere Angelo Maria Ricci, followed with a short composition called *Il Capitolo*, which is a poetic vision in the style of Dante; the lyric ode. The secretary introduced the architect, Gaspare Servi, a composition styled *i Decasillabi* or lyric poetry of ten syllables in each line. This gentleman is one of the council of the year for the Tiberine academy. Epigrams were produced in Italian and Latin by Cavaliere Michael Angelo Barberi, and the Abbate Don Antonio Somai, the treasurer. Sonnets and other light productions, by the following academicians, were interspersed, viz., Count Thomas Gnoli, dean of the consistorial advocates, Reverend Raimondo Pigliacelli, professor of theology in the Urban college of the Propaganda, Messrs. Philip Zampi, of the council, and Hannibal Lepsi, perpetual archivist of the academy.

Linchi, or Lynxes: This is considered one of the most scientific academies of the city. The proper title is Nuovi Linchi, or New Lynxes. The old society to which it succeeds had done an immensity for science, but had ceased to exist. The principal object is to look out with the watchfulness designated by the name for the discoveries and improvements of natural philosophy in every place, and to turn them to advantage. The Cavaliere Don Feliciano Scarpellini, a respectable priest, is the director and perpetual secretary. Their meeting place is in the capitol, in which is an observatory under the care of this learned director:—there is another at the Roman college under the care of the Jesuits.

On the evening of the 13th, a meeting of this academy was held at which nine cardinals were present, besides a great number of prelates of various grades and several of the nobility, clergy, and literati. The session was opened with an oration delivered by Cardinal Odescalchi, Bishop of Sabina, Vice-chancellor of the holy Roman See, archpriest of the basilic of St. John Lateran, and prefect of the congregation of affairs of bishops and regulars. In it, his eminence, in fine language,

exhibited and described the motives which animated and urged Prince Frederic Cesi, the founder of this excellent academy.

This cardinal was followed by the Caviliere Scarpellini, a man dear to science and to literature, precious to this academy, to which he concentrates honourable and heavy labours. He gave a summary of the academical acts of the past year; in which he exhibited the exertions and progress of the distinguished members and their merited rewards. He dwelt with peculiar emphasis and satisfaction on an exceedingly useful discovery in optics, by the illustrious Signor Alberto Gatti, the extraordinary perfection given to reflecting mirrors in *pietra dura,* and which is a matter of the very first importance in the construction of telescopes. In doing so he not only bestowed the due meed of praise to the inventor, but paid a just compliment to the papal government which animated, aided, and urged him forward in his exertions, as also to the academy that saw the utility of the discovery and exerted itself to procure the advantage for science and the credit for Rome.

On the evening of the 10th of this month the academy of the Archeologia held their last stated meeting for the academical year. They will not assemble for ordinary business until after October. On this occasion the secretary read a dissertation transmitted by the corresponding associate, Cavaliere Luigi Nardi, in which he gives the history of the commentaries of Pope Pius II., who died in 1464, having governed the church nearly six years. The associate describes the different editions of this work, and informs the academy that an apograph, or early MS. copy of these commentaries of an early date, has been found in the Gambalunga of Rimino, which has many very fine and useful passages, by which this work of the learned pontiff can be well corrected and made perfect, as has long been desired.

The respectable secretary then entered upon a train of reasoning favourable to show the early culture of Italian arts, founded on the painting of an antique Italian vase, found this year in the Bolsenian excavations, and kept in the fine collection of the Companari in this city. This vase is a Tyrrhenian pitcher, two Roman palms and nine inches in height. On the principal side, it exhibits, distinguished by their names, Ajax and Achilles. They appear to have cast lots to decide as the secretary supposes, some military contest. The perfect execution of the figures in black upon a yellow ground, in the best style, does honour to the artist already well known by his other discovered works; he has marked his name, Ezecia, in two places upon this vessel, which is one of the most precious that is known.

Amongst other honorary members present, were the cardinals Zurla,

Sala, Castracane, and Grimaldi, and also Monsignor Ciacchi, Governor of Rome.

Besides the above, I know of the following, viz.: The Academy of Noble Ecclesiastics. Protector, Cardinal Pacca, dean of the sacred college, and Bishop of Ostia; President, the Most Reverend James Sinibaldi, Archbishop of Damietta.—Theological Academy holding its meeting in the Roman University. Protectors, Cardinals Pacca, Zurla, Lambruschini, and Albano; Secretary, Reverend Angelo Mai. Unica of Ecclesiastics of St. Paul, held in the church of Sant. Appolinara. Protector, Cardinal Zurla; First Regulator, Most Reverend John Soglia, Archbishop of Ephesus; Secretary-general, Reverend Pius Bighi. The Arcadia, for lighter literature and improvisation; its ordinary meetings are held at the Serbatorio, in the Via del Lavatore, near the splendid fountain of Trevi; the solemn ones at the Capitol. Guardian-general, the Reverend Gabriel Laureani; Pro-guardian, Don Paolo Barola. The Latin Academy holds its sessions in the Palazzo Sinibaldi; of this, the lawyer Francis Guadagni is president, and Signor Frederic Petrilli is secretary. The Philharmonic Academy unites perhaps the most splendid assemblage of vocal and instrumental performers in any one body in the world. I have been more than once at their performance, to which, in the proper seasons, the respectable strangers in the city are generously invited. It is a pity that their rooms are not larger. The principal one would scarcely accommodate four hundred persons. At present, Prince D. Francis Borghese is prince of this academy, and Signor Joseph Spada is secretary:—their rooms are in the Palazzo Lancelloti, near the Piazza Navona. The Philodramatic Academy holds its meetings at No. 18, near the Palazzo Cesarini in the Via del Pavone, under the presidency of the commander, Pietro of the Princes Odescalchi; the secretary is Signor Joseph Capobianchi. The names of these several societies sufficiently denote with the explanations given what are their general objects.—I do not know of any other. I believe they are twelve in all.

The Theological Schools are numerous, and the rivalry in science is not small. Amongst those schools one belonging to the Franciscan order has lately made a considerable display. In 1588, Pope Sixtus V. founded the college of St. Bonaventure in the convent of the XII. Apostles, for young minor conventual students. This has generally sustained a fair character and produced some learned men. In last June, a triennial examination for degrees was held, and the objectors were not idle. The bachelors who had attained their first honours in the provincial schools of the order, now came to this college not only to

seek their higher grade by examination, but also by literary contest, to seek for the pre-eminence of their several schools and teachers. Cardinal Brancadoro, who is now seventy-nine years of age, and thirty-three years a cardinal, and is the senior on the bench of cardinal-priests—is Archbishop of Fermo and protector of this college. Being unable to attend, he requested Pacca, the cardinal-dean, to represent him. The degrees of the successful candidates were conferred under the regency of the reverend father, Master Hyacinth Guarlerni, on Saturday the 12th inst. After which, the Reverend Father Collegial, Antonio Cosaro of Calatafemi, in Sicily, who had been selected for the purpose, defended his theses, which he had dedicated to Cardinal Brancadoro.—The defence was made in the church of the XII.—I remained only a few moments, and as the propositions that I saw selected by the objectors, were mere squabbles upon scholastic opinions, I took but little interest in the useless subtlety of metaphysical abstraction in which they were engaged.

The following is a list of the theological seminaries and colleges of Rome, besides that of the Roman University or Sapienza. I give them here as they are recognised though in many instances, two are united in one establishment, and others, though they keep separate houses, yet attend the same course of lectures. 1. The Roman seminary for the diocess of Rome. 2. The seminary of the chapter of St. Peter's, for that church, and so forth. Colleges:—3. The Roman, taught by the Jesuits. 4. The Urban, at the Propaganda. 5. Germanico Hungarian, at the Gesù. 6. Of St. Thomas of Aquin. 7. Salviati. 8. Capranicense. 9. English. 10. Scotch, now at the Propaganda. 11. Irish. 12. Greeks, at the Propaganda. 13. Maronists, do. 14. Ginnasi. 15. Pamphili. 16. Bandinelli. 17. Ghislieri. 18. Clementine. 19. Nazarene. 20. Sabine, (not occupied.) Of Liege, do. 22. Of Neophytes. 23. Carasoli Piceno.

The Roman University, or the Sapienza, is an institution of vast literary convenience and unusual facilities. Its body of professors is a host indeed: its schools open to every aspirant. I shall give you the summary. The Cardinal Camerlengo of the holy Roman church, is ex-officio arch-chancellor of this university. (Galleffi is at present Camerlengo.) Deputy-rector; Monsignor Jerome Bontadosi, consistorial advocate. The first college is that of consistorial advocates, consisting of a dean, secretary, and seven members. The vice-rector is the advocate Raffaelle Bertinelli. Second college—Theologians, a president, secretary, and fourteen members, of whom two only are seculars; the others of the various religious orders. Third

college—Medicine and Surgery, a dean, secretary, and sixteen doctors. Fourth college—Philosophy, a president and thirteen members. Fifth college—Philology, a president and eight members. In the list of the above councillors is many a learned name. Professors and Lecturers —1. Sacred Department.—Holy Scriptures, one. Speculative Theology, three. Theological topics, one. Moral Theology, one. Ecclesiastical History, one. Sacred Physics, one. 2. Department of Laws.—Natural Law and Law of Nations, one. Public Ecclesiastical Law, one. Institutions of Canon Law, one. Texts of Canon Law, one. Institutes of Civil Law, one. Texts of Civil Law, two. Institutes of Criminal Law, one. 3. Department of Medicine and Surgery.—Anatomical Institutes, one. Physiology, one. Elements of Christianity, one. Botany, one. Practical Botany, one. Pathology, and so forth, one. Therapeutics and Materia Medica, one. Theory and Practice of Medicine, one. Medical Jurisprudence, one. Clinical Lectures, two. Comparative Anatomy and Natural History of Animals, one. Surgery, and so forth, one. Obstetrics, one. Clinical Surgery, one. Practical Pharmacy, one. Veterinary Surgery, one. 4. Department of Philosophy. —Experimental Physics, one. Introduction to the Calculus, one. Sublime Calculus, one. Mechanics and Hydraulics, one. Optics and Astronomy, one. Architecture as connected with Statics and Hydraulics, one. Descriptive Geometry, one. Mineralogy and Natural History, one. Archeology, one. 5. Department of Philosophy.—Latin and Italian Eloquence, and Roman History, one. Hebrew, one. Arabic, one. Syro-Chaldaic, one. Besides these forty-seven professors, all paid by the Pope, there are six jubilated or superannuated professors, five emeriti, or persons having honorably retired, and two honorary—besides the director of the chancery. Yet Rome is the enemy of learning!!!

Persia. Legal Decision of the Primacy of St. Peter:—Letters have been received at the Propaganda from Teheran, in Persia, which give an account of a curious trial, that had just terminated. The schismatical Armenian bishop of Giulfa, had prosecuted the Catholic missionaries, before the supreme ecclesiastical tribunal of Persia, for preaching the supremacy of the Pope, and others, withdrawing from the junction of the Armenian Patriarch, a number of his people, under the pretext that the Bishop of Rome had obtained from Jesus jurisdiction over all Christians. On the day appointed for the trial, the prosecuting bishop with his clergy and a large body of followers, came into court, bringing a youth of eighteen years old, who had become a Catholic. Curiosity also brought a great number of persons. After

many charges and much abuse against Catholics by the prosecutor, the judge turned to the missionaries to inquire what they had to say. They had brought a Persian copy of the Bible, and the youth opening it, begged the judge to read the last chapter of the gospel according to St. John, which he did to himself. Then he ordered his officer to read it aloud, and turning to the accuser and his commissioners, asked them what explanation they could give of the words addressed to Peter,—"feed my lambs," "feed my sheep." The parties explained it of flocks of sheep and lambs, which they said Jesus had. The Persians could not contain their laughter, and the judge himself was forced to join in. The magistrate then taking up the explanation given by the Catholics, said: "The feeding of his flock entrusted by Jesus Christ to Peter, cannot be explained materially, for Jesus Christ had no such flocks, but he sent Peter and his companions to teach those who were to become a flock under his charge, and this must clearly be understood of a singular and particular authority which he gave to Peter as head of all Christians, called sheep and lambs by Jesus Christ, and consequently the Popes who succeed to that Peter, have this authority in their society." The Persians as usual, cried out *Beli, Beli,* to signify their assent, and the cause of Catholicity triumphed.

August 1.—Cardinal Antonio Palotta died on the 19th of July, at a country house near Cassiano. His remains were carried thence to Rome, to the church of San Sylvestro In Capite, which was that of his title; and on the morning of Saturday, the 26th, the usual papal chapel was held, though His Holiness did not attend on the occasion; there were, however, many cardinals and several prelates present. The High Mass of Requiem was sung by his eminence Cardinal del Drago, titular priest of San Lorenzo, in *pane e perna,* and after the usual ceremonial, the body was interred in that church.

The deceased was of a family of Caldarola, in the territory of Piceno: he was born on the 23rd of February, 1770, in Ferrara, of Count John Maria Palotta and the Countless Cynthia Maffei; he received his usual course of education in the seminary of Frascati, and in the Nazarene College, in Rome. He made his legal studies under the superintendence of his uncle, Cardinal William Palotta, the third of his family who attained that dignity. In 1795, Pope Pius VI. enrolled young Palotta in the college of Prelates Refendaries, of both signatures, *i. e.,* of grace and justice. In 1800, soon after his promotion to the papal chair, Pope Pius VII. named him to a canonship in the basilic of St. Peter's, transferred him to the college of Prothonotaries Apostolic,

and made him his Ponente, or drawer of briefs, for the congregation of good government, and also made him a consulting prelate of the congregations of the council, and of the income and expenditure of the church of St. Peter. In 1802 he was declared auditor of the supreme tribunal of the signature; in 1814, upon the return of His Holiness from his imprisonment by Napoleon, Palotta was placed in charge of the great hospital of Santo Spirito, as commendatore, or president in command; and in 1816, was made Uditore Generale della Camera, which is chief justice in law and equity. In all those arduous stations [which] required talents, information, activity, and closé application to business, the deceased gave very general satisfaction. By the same Pontiff, he was created cardinal, on the consistory of March 10th, 1823, and in a consistory soon afterwards, was made priest of the title of San Sylvestro In Capite, which church had previously given the title to another cardinal of his name, viz., John Baptist Palotta.

The deceased was actively employed, being engaged in the duties of the following congregations, viz.: Apostolic Visitation, Consistorial, of Bishops and Regulars, of Rites, of the revenue and expenditure of St. Peters, of Loretto, of Good Government. Thus, between his private devotions and public duties, his hours were filled up until it pleased the Lord to call him from this transitory scene, in the 65th year of his age. May he rest in peace. Amen.

Ecclesiastical Seminaries:—A work has lately been printed at the Propaganda, and just published, which is, for many reasons, interesting. The original German of the author has not yet made its appearance, but this Italian translation has been made under the eye of the author, and piece by piece, as he produced the original. The translator is an accomplished scholar and exceedingly respectable man. Preface, work, and appendix, comprise nearly 500 octavo pages of Italian. Having heard much more of this work, than of several others, from gentlemen for whose judgment I have great respect; I have had but little time to devote as yet to its pages, though I have gone through several of them; I shall, therefore, content myself at present, by translating for your readers, the remarks of the Diario Romano of July 26, upon this production.

"The Urban College has lately sent from its press, the translation of a German work, which, under the modest title of *The Ecclesiastical Seminary, or Eight Days at St. Eusebius in Rome,* contains great erudition, and ought to inspire with the deepest interest, not only worthy ecclesiastics, but all those who have at heart the increase and honour of our holy religion. The author is Doctor Augustin Theiner, a young German of brisk genius and vast knowledge, who having, during several years, strayed away from sound Catholic doctrine, has been fully reconciled

in Rome to that truth, and to that church which is its infallible mistress. Grieved to the heart for having, by his former writings, given matter of destruction and scandal to Catholic Germany, he desires, in this work, to consecrate to her the joyful first fruits of his sincere conversion.''

''And since no one knows better than he does the state of decay into which ecclesiastical discipline has fallen in several parts of Germany, the baneful education which the aspirants to orders receive in their universities, and the contempt in which the Episcopal seminaries are held; he is disposed to make an effort for reanimating them with the true spirit of the priesthood, by showing what is the true genius of ecclesiastical education, and what are the institutions which the church has by her laws, and by the constant practice of all ages, most wisely ordained and inculcated for the education of the Catholic clergy. This has led him to compile a philosophical history of ecclesiastical seminaries, which he has divided into three parts. The two first comprehend the periods, from the first century to the reign of Charlemagne; and from that to the time of the Council of Trent; the third is dedicated to the subsequent period. In the two first parts, the author exhibits his intimate acquaintance with the monuments of ecclesiastical antiquities, illustrations, and sustains his assertions with opposite extracts from the writers of the several ages. In the third part, his historical recital is much more full, and he places in a proper light the great merits of St. Ignatius of Loyola, and his society, for the education of the clergy; he carefully describes the origin of the German College in Rome; shows how this excited the fathers of Trent to the compilation of their most salutary decree for the creation of seminaries throughout the church.''

''And here the author, with equal zeal, erudition, and diligence, following the order of time, relates the performances of zealous bishops, of religious princes, and above all, what the Roman pontiffs have done to carry this ordinance of Trent to its fullest execution; and how, by their united exertions, the church was enriched with the most useful institutions of every description for ecclesiastical education.''

''Arrived in his narrative towards the close of the eighteenth century, he begins with a clear eye to discern, and with steadiness to point out, the destruction which a false philosophy and public revolutions brought upon education; and he shows the wretched changes which they caused in seminaries, particularly in Germany. He next recounts the more recent efforts made by the Holy See to re-establish throughout Christendom the sound education of the clergy; he runs over the concordats made by it with various princes, as they bear upon his subject; and concludes with several reflections adapted to the spiritual wants of Catholic Germany. An appendix of documents follows.''

''The value of this erudite work is greatly enhanced, and its interest considerably increased, by a long and beautiful prefatory, in which the author, with an amiable ingenuity, and an eloquence of simple natural pathos, recounts to an astonished friend, the changes of his life, his travels, his errors, and the wondrous ways by which divine mercy drew him to the source of salvation.''

''This work, of about 500 pages, has been translated by James Mazzio from the German manuscript, which has been sent them from Germany, to be printed and published.''

Cholera:—Though the health of Italy is good, yet as this disease, from which Providence has hitherto protected the Papal states, has shown itself in Spain, the holy father has appointed a commission to

take the necessary precautions, and to digest from the sanitary code a collection of such regulations as might be considered useful.

Naples. Vesuvius:—For some time, from the early part of July, the eruptions of this mountain had ceased; but, on the morning of the 18th, its appearance was calculated to attract universal attention: not only the gaze of the crowd, but the contemplation of the philosopher.

About two hours before midday, two new but small craters opened within that which had been formed at the last eruption. As if they were measured by a clock, at intervals of each half hour during the day, columns of smoke, ashes, and stones arose from within; but, about eight in the evening, the mountain really seemed to labour and to tremble, and get violently agitated; four streams of lava now poured from the old crater, and flowed in the direction of Torre del Greco; one of them came only about half way down the head of ashes and lava round the summit, the other three came to the lower extremity of this region, and ran a little on the bare side of the mountain. About nine o'clock, two enormous columns of fire, like immense blazing pine-trees, rose to an extraordinary height; a thick mass of dark smoke surrounded them, and spreading round, darkened the regions on every side, involving the entire in a palpable darkness as far as the hermitage of the Saviour. This continued until about two in the morning of the 19th. Three new streams of lava now began to flow down from the old crater, and the other four began to move forward, and advanced at least a mile beyond the extinguished lava of the former eruptions, but without touching on any cultivated grounds. Thus, then, there were formed at the circumference of the old crater two channels, in which liquid volcanic matter ran like water. Towards seven o'clock in the evening, the streams of lava appeared to be exhausted, but the crater yet continued to vomit forth great quantities of ashes, of fire, of stones, and of smoke, in the form of an enormous and stately pine. This terrific tree seemed to increase greatly during the night, and three currents of ignited matter, pouring from the edge of the crater itself, rushed towards the Plain of Brooms, always upon the bed of old lava. On the morning of the 20th, the column which we have described was so elevated and extended, that for a great distance it obscured the heavens, whilst within the great crater, whose vast aperture was within two days extended by about one hundred additional feet, two other small ones were formed, each about sixty feet in elevation. The lava which they now gave out was not, as it had previously been, innocuous: but the streams that flowed this day, did mischief to some farms in the district of Torre del Greco.

A sort of truce gave quiet to the day, for some hours before noon;

but, in the evening, the eruption began with unusual violence. Not less than fourteen streams of lava flowed on all sides from the summit; and after midnight, the moans and bellowing of the volcano were terrific; an immense mass of ashes, water, stones, and smoke was driven to the heavans; the moon was quite darkened; the stones were thrown to such an elevation, that thirty-two seconds fully elapsed before they began to tumble, like an immense hail-shower. About two o'clock, A. M., of the 21st, this tremendous exhibition began to terminate: the riot did not commence until about one o'clock, P. M. Eight streams of lava now flowed: some towards the Plain of Brooms, some towards the Crocelle de Cantarnoni, some towards the hermitage, some towards the ditch of Vetrand. In the evening, a most violent explosion drew every eye to the mountain, an immense portion of the crater's edge disappeared, an enlargement of two hundred additional feet was made. As if satisfied with this havoc, the murmuring was hushed, the phenomenon began to diminish; and at half past two in the morning of the 22d, the lava had ceased to flow, and the mighty monster seemed to sink from weariness to sleep.

Bible de Vence:—This excellent work has been translated into Italian, from the fifth Paris edition, which was published under the editorship of the celebrated and learned Drach, formerly a scientific Jewish rabbi, but now librarian of the Urban college of the Propaganda in Rome.

This fine literary production is in course of publication at Milan, under the superintendence of the learned Professor Bartolomeo Catena, keeper of the Ambrosian library. The work is enriched with an atlas and ichnographical plates, and new scientific illustrations; already nineteen parts of the text, twenty-five of the dissertations, and four of the atlas have been delivered to the subscribers. Rondet published the first French edition, besides the many excellent additions and enrichments of the subsequent four editions. Italy, as if jealous of honour, literary fame, and religious knowledge, would not consent that this excellent work should appear in the garb of her country, without at least receiving some enrichment from herself; hence some of her most talented and erudite sons have contributed their labours to the perfection of this sacred work. The biblical text is that of the vulgate, diligently compared and amended; the Italian version that of Martini, accurately compared with the best editions, and corrected and collated with the manuscript itself.

August 2. St. Peter's Chains:—Yesterday was the festival of

the liberation of St. Peter, or as it is called, "St. Peter's Chains," and I was desirous of being present at the church at which it is celebrated, but a slight indisposition prevented my going out in the morning. In the afternoon I got into a carriage and told the coachman to drive to the Esquiline hill to San Pietro in Vincola. When I arrived I found the open space in front occupied by carriages, a few beggars, and a considerable number of persons going in and coming out. A large screen of canvas was extended forward like a shed at a considerable height, attached to the front of the church, to keep off the scorching sun, and the ground was strewed with bay and other sweet-smelling evergreens and other shrubs. Upon entering the church I perceived they were chanting the solemn second vespers at the principal altar. The church was decorated with fine crimson silk and gold lace, covering many of the columns in the principal parts, and a large portion of the walls. Other tapestry was covering other parts. The abbot was seated at the epistle side of the altar, coped and mitred, and his community occupied their places in the recess behind the altar, to its front, for this is one of the old fashioned altars whose back is to the church. I took my place in the transept on the same side, under the splendid and powerful organ, having opposite to me at the other extremity of the transept, the magnificent mausoleum of Pope Julius II., of which the extraordinary statue of Moses, by Michael Angelo, forms the most striking part. The music was indeed rich and varied, and the singing of the choir was exquisite.

About midway between the porch and the altar, on your right hand as you enter in, [is] the altar on which the relics from which the church takes its title were placed on this festival. It was richly decorated, and the candles were lighted. A fine casket of considerable size contained [the relics.] They are the chains with which it is said the Apostle St. Peter was bound in Jerusalem and in Rome, and which are said to have miraculously united. I have not as yet examined the evidence on which the assertion rests; and as it is no article of faith, I am not called upon to believe farther than my own judgment will have dictated after having examined the special grounds of the assertion. I shall, for the present, suppose the truth of the statement. I have a promise from the abbot of being furnished with a copy of the testimony, which I shall examine at my leisure. From time to time a priest in a surplice and stole, came, properly accompanied, to the altar, opened the casket, and drawing out the chain, one extremity of which remained fastened to the interior of the case itself, applied the other extremity to the necks of those who knelt before him, after which they

kissed the relic, whilst he repeated a short form of prayer on their behalf. As I had not the opportunity of examining the church and relics as closely as I could wish, by reason of the service and of the crowd, I departed, determined to go this morning, at an early hour, for that purpose.

Accordingly I went and had every facility. I saw the abbot, who is an exceedingly learned man, Dom Paolo Del Signore, Professor of Church History in the Roman University, and having told him my desire to examine minutely the chains and their history, he kindly accompanied me, and gave directions to all concerned with any department of the establishment, to give me full information, and aid, and opportunity.

I went to the altar upon which the chains were placed. This case stands upon four short silver-gilt legs, about an inch in height; it is made of hard wood lined with velvet, and covered outside with plates of highly chased silver: it is about eight or ten inches high, about fifteen or sixteen inches front and twelve deep: the cover, which is solidly attached, rises gradually towards the centre from four sides, to about two inches in height, and the projection is less than half an inch, the entire in the form of a roof nearly square; a child, finely executed in silver, with a loose, flying drapery, stands on its summit with his right hand moderately extended and holding a tiara, his left is gracefully and easily carried across his chest, towards the right side, a little above the hip, and from it hangs a chain. The chasing is principally free fancy scroll-work around seraphim. The front is a gate, having two large oval glazed apertures, through which you see the links of chain coiled up within the case. I opened this and drew out the chain. It consists of thirty-two links of moderate size, about from three to four inches in length. I should suppose the heaviest link would not exceed the weight of six ounces; at one extremity is a light sort of hoop sufficiently large to embrace the neck or both wrists; it consists of two parts united to each other, and to the chain, by a rivet or gudgeon, on which, as on a hinge, they turn; one of these has a loop or eye at its extremity, and the other two prongs, one of which being introduced into the eye both might with some force be so twisted together as to secure the junction, and confine whatever was inclosed by the hoop. Upon close examination it will be easily perceived that there are three descriptions of links: four are much lighter and more delicate than the rest, and that one by which they are united to the others has the soldering of the junction made with silver. These links are said to have belonged to the chain with which St. Paul was bound. A number of

the other links, I did not count how many, but I should suppose eight or ten, are less gross than the others, and appear much more worn at the places of contact. No mark of junction, however, is observable: and it is, moreover, asserted that one of the chains with which the Apostle was bound under Herod, in Jerusalem, having been given in that city to Eudocia, the Empress of Theodosius the Younger, was sent by her to Rome to her daughter Eudoxia, who brought it to the Pope, and he had in his possession a chain with which the Apostle had been bound in Rome under Nero; both chains formed, as it were, a spontaneous union, by the immediate influence of the divine power; and the links of St. Paul's chain having been added, they are preserved as memorials and relics, by means of which the faith of the people might be strengthened, and on regular days of solemn observance, the facts might be better brought under public consideration, and the gratitude and piety of the multitude increased, in like manner as God himself regulated the exhibition of the brazen serpent to the multitude of Israel, the preservation of the manna in the ark, the rod of Aaron, and other relics which the chosen people long held in pious veneration. One of these links is fastened to the interior of the case by a hasp; and the case itself, whilst it remains upon this altar, is chained to it, and under continual observation. It is exhibited twice in the year; once on a day within the octave of SS. Peter and Paul, I think the 3d of July, and on the first of August, and during its octave. The painting at this altar is the delivery of Peter from prison by the angel, as related in *Acts* xii.

At other times the relic, enclosed in its casket, is placed in a large case of less costly materials, and kept in a recess in the wall of the society, with some other relics. This recess is closed by an iron grating, the key of whose lock is held by the abbot; outside this grate is a beautiful bronze gate with two locks, the key of one of which is kept by the cardinal, who is titular of this church, at present Castracane degli Antimenelli, and the other by the Pope's major-domo, at present the Most Reverend Doctor Patrizi, Archbishop of Philippi.

The church is built upon the site of the baths of Titus, on the Esquiline, not very far from the Coliseum. The original building which dates as far back as the end of the fifth century, did not extend beyond the present main nave as far as the transept. This is easily distinguished from the rest; it consists of three aisles separated by two colonnades crowned with arches; the middle aisle is about forty feet wide, and each of the others about half that breadth. In each of those, I may call them arcades, are ten fine fluted Doric columns of Grecian

marble taken from the baths of Dioclesian; each shaft is but a single block, upwards of twenty feet in length. Upon a smart friction with iron, a sub-sulphureous smell is perceptible. At the termination of this middle aisle, is a lofty arch, sustained by two fine columns of granite with marble capitols of the composite order—this begins the more recent, but yet sufficiently ancient part of the building. The large conch-like recess which forms the sanctuary, was a portion of the baths of Titus. The altar and choir are on the ancient model; the altar considerably forward, with its back towards the church, so that the celebrant standing at it faces the congregation; and the benches of the choir attached to the wall of the recess, with the president's seat at its extremity exactly facing the altar, but having it between him and the people. I shall not in this place speak of its decorations or paintings, or any other particulars. Between this recess and the old church of Eudoxia is the transept, a fine open space: when you enter it and look towards the altar, you have on your left a beautiful organ, and on your right at the other extremity, the splendid monument of Julius II., who died [in] 1513. I cannot undertake to describe this. But probably as few of your readers have seen accounts of it, I shall give them a very faint idea of this great work of the celebrated sculptor, whose conceptions were all gigantic as his genius.

The monument occupies the larger portion of the extremity of the transept, and consists of two stories. The lower consists of three compartments, and is upwards of twenty feet high. Four immense blocks of pure white marble projecting from the back and formed into partitions whose fronts are decorated with bold and beautiful scrolls, and bear various emblematic devices, give a division of three great stalls, of which that in the centre is much the largest. Seated in this, considerably forward, in any easy, dignified and commanding attitude, in a loose flowing robe with the tables of the law resting in his right hand, the colossal figure of the mighty leader of the host of Israel fixes the attention of the most negligent. Every joint is massy, every limb is immense, but the entire is in the most symmetrical proportion. The muscles of that arm which smote the rock seem braced as the rock itself, and yet you would imagine that the finger of an infant would leave the impression of its touch upon the surface: the drapery would change its folds in the agitation of the breeze, or with the motion of the limb it covers. There is something expressively majestic in the flowing of those wreaths of beard, the eye shows beaten vigour, and penetration, and looks upon some object of mighty moment, with a degree of interest, mingled with momentary satisfac-

tion, and the consciousness of the power to command—the lips are parted, and we are not astonished to hear, that the mighty artist, when he perfected his work, stood with his own eye riveted upon that face, and after the absorption of his faculties—carried away by his feeling, and anxious to know what lay concealed, impatiently struck the knees, which he could reach with his chisel, and cried, "Speak!!!"

The figure of Meditation in the niche on his right, and that of Prudence on his left, would, if placed elsewhere, be well worthy of attention. They as well as those over them were made by Mateo Lupo —but the observer is perpetually drawn off, without perceiving the process by which it is effected, to the principal figure itself. The second story is divided in like manner. The Pontiff, Julius II., is reclining in a posture half raised from his cushion, and stooping forward as if to point the observers to the contemplation of the sainted Hebrew who sits below. He is in pontificals, wearing his tiara. In a niche considerably above him, is a finely-executed statue of Religion, with a child in her arms; this innocent holds a bird that attracts his attention; as far as I could observe it was a dove, emblematic of himself. In the recesses at each side of the Pontiff, are Temperance on the right, and Political Sagacity upon the left. The effect produced by the group is magnificent.

Turning to my left, to enter the sacristy by a door which is to the right of the monument, my attention was arrested by the painting over the altar which was close at hand, and which terminated the right aisle of the church. It was not large, nor was the light strong, nor the piece very distinctly seen, yet I saw that it was worthy of a master's name. I am no connoisseur. I am ignorant of those phrases which are familiar even to companions of the virtuosi. But I know when I am affected; and generally I can discover what occasions the feeling. A fine female figure, in which calm dignity, without affectation, and the expression of a noble intellect, were blended with the intrepidity of that heroism which becomes her sex, and that softness and delicacy which are compatible with the strength and vigour and healthful firmness of attained womanhood. A terrific dragon, whose glaring eyeballs showed a raging fire that burned without consuming, whose distended mouth exhibited a projected tongue whose point was formidable, and whose livid hue denoted the poison with which it was swollen, gave also to the view its destructive ranges of teeth; the vapour which issued from the throat of this monster seemed pestilential even to the eye; and many a scaly and nervous fold was discerned through the murky mass which covered the abyss that

glowed below. With her eye steadily fixed on the monster, Margaret serenely contemplated the vain efforts that he made; whilst her right hand steadily held aloft, even within his view, that cross by which she was protected! How beautifully impressive was the lesson that it taught! showing at once the violence, the fury, and the origin of passion, and the facility with which it is overcome by the powerful application of the merits of a crucified Saviour! The brother drew aside the curtain from the window. The countenance of the saint was mildly radiant; and the fire of the assailant seemed more hot. Her serenity was undisturbed, her drapery was exquisite. Hers was the expression of that humble consciousness of divine support, by which victory is felt as secure even before the close of the contest. I asked who was the artist. "He was," said the brother, "a man who wanted bread. He had genius, but he found no protector. He would have died of hunger, but for the canons regular of the Lateran basilic; for such is our title though others have been substituted for us in that church. Our community saved Guercino from want, and in return for the hospitality he received, he repaid us by his pencil." "And this St. Margaret is by Guercino," said I—I must stop here to-day.

August 4. San Pietro in Vincola:—Leaving the altar of St. Margaret, we went towards the sacristy. The hall into which we first entered had a finely paved floor of large mosaic. many of the component parts of which were *pietra dura*, or precious stone, as contradistinguished from marble. The pavement itself was that of the ancient baths of Titus, as was that of the two rooms that served for the sacristy. To me the contemplation of this floor was one of the best evidences of the imperial wealth and general luxury of Rome, about eighteen centuries ago. Porphyry, serpentino, stellato, were amongst the more ordinary parts, giallo antico, verde antico, rosso antico, were in possession.

My object was to see the place in which the chains are usually kept. The recess is about three feet deep in the thickness of the wall, and carefully lined. It is over the vesting table opposite you as you enter, at the height of about six feet from the floor to the sill of the doors. The aperture is about four feet square in the centre of the wall; it is surrounded by a fine entablature of antique yellow marble with its mouldings neatly executed;—at the sides are two Ionic pilasters of Sicilian jasper, with the caps and volutes of marble richly gilt. Midway towards the angle on each side, are corresponding marble panels in the wall, each nearly as large as the aperture. Each of

these consists of three slabs of equal size; that in the centre is serpentino stellato, with dark porphyry on either side. Your readers might not all know, that this serpentino is a stone of a varied green colour, and is harder than marble, therefore it is called *pietra dura,* or hard stone; it has the same quality as cornelian, jasper, and so forth; when it has a number of small white stars, it is called *stellato.* This is rare and much esteemed. These panels are surrounded by old mosaic.

The ceiling is vaulted, but the arches which form this vault spring from the four sides, and as the room is not a square, but an oblong parallelogram about twenty feet by fifteen, a panel formed where the arches would meet is oblong too. Upon this there is a fine fresco of the liberation of Peter by the angel. Four other frescoes surround this on the vault; at the head is Peter getting out of his boat to walk to Jesus whom he sees upon the shore, at the foot is the committal of Peter to prison by Herod, on the right is the death of Annanias and Sapphira, and on the left, the healing of the cripple who asked alms at the Beautiful gate of the temple. At the angles, niches rise in the vaults, in which appropriate devices are given; three niches also rise at each side of the vault from the springing of the arch. In the centre one, over the recess for the preservation of the relics, is a fresco of the blessed Virgin, and the others are occupied by saints of the order. The remainder of the ceiling was decorated, in the year 1500, by Zucchari, with sprigs and scrolls after the manner of the baths of Titus; these are also coloured in fresco and are in excellent preservation.

The gates of the recess are perhaps some of the best executed bronzes in existence; each gate consists of three panels, the middle one being the principal; this is about eighteen inches square, surrounded by a fine border, with varied enrichings in delicate bronze. The subject on the one to your left as you examine, is the imprisonment of Peter. Upon the portion which exhibits the main group, there are at least seventeen human figures in various reliefs and different attitudes; the whole is wrought in a masterly and delicate style. Herod is seated on his tribunal, with his emblems of office, the seat is in a fine niche of a large building; from the windows of the upper floor a number of persons are seen looking at the crowd that proceeds from the tribunal to the gate of the prison; the apostle is seen prominent in this crowd, with an air of dignified resignation, approaching the door, into which the keeper is thrusting his ponderous key. In the background, in fine perspective, is seen the front of some public building with three large niches, at various distances from the spectator, each containing some

statue. The drapery is finely wrought, and on many of the figures portions of it are remarkably well gilt. Some of the persons appear to stand out fully separated from the panel, whilst little more than the outline of others is descernible. On the oblong panel, over this, in the upper compartment, are two winged children, one at each extremity, who holds the ends of a finely filled festoon of leaves and flowers; over the centre of the festoon is the scutcheon with the family arms of Rovera; a sort of tree with its branches interwoven at the top, and the tiara projecting. On the lower compartment, which corresponds in size and shape with the upper, are two trees, one at each extremity, the trunks near the ends, and the higher branches extending so as to meet nearly at the top of the centre; under each tree is a winged child, and in the centre the inscription in raised letters, *Sixtus Quartus Pontifex Maximus.*

On the corresponding gate to your right hand, the upper compartment is similar, but that a cardinal's hat supplies the place of the tiara. The only difference in the lower compartment is the inscription; which is: *Julius Card. sancti Petri ad vincula; sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Pœnitentiarius. mccccIxxvii.* The middle panel is divided into three parts. That on your right exhibits the interior of a prison, the apostle is lying on the floor, chained to a soldier on each side, both sleeping, one reclined, the other nearly erect and leaning against an angle. The angel is awaking the apostle; and in the background other sleepers are seen, soldiers and prisoners intermixed. In the centre is the passage outside this dungeon which extends down a good distance in excellent perspective, with a statue in a niche at its termination. The angel leads Peter from the dungeon, treading cautiously upon some armour that lies scattered over the floor. The apostle seems doubting the reality of his delivery, yet is very careful to keep close to his conductor; the compartment to your left in the outer wall of the prison in which was the large iron gate, which spontaneously opened to allow a passage, after passing through which, the apostle felt assured of his safety.

The collections of leaves and other decorations that go around each gate comprising its three panels, are wrought with a lightness and softness of appearance equal to wax. This is one of the chief d'œuvres of the brothers Pullajoli, who cast the fine gates of St. Peter's at the Vatican. Their remains are interred in this church at the Esquiline. The Cardinal Julius Rovera was nephew to Pope Sixtus IV., and had this and other works executed for this church, of which he was the titular cardinal-priest.

August 11.—You observe that a week has elapsed since I concluded the preceding sentence. Since then, the respectable abbot of St. Peter's has kindly furnished me with the dissertation which he promised, compiled by one of his order. It is a work now very scarce, of about fifty pages quarto; a production which, however, must have occupied much time, and required great patience and profound research. The writer is one of those laborious, enlightened, judicious, and candid critics, whom the monasteries have furnished in great abundance. He shows that it cannot be distinctly known at present whether the church, which originally stood upon the site now occupied by that in which the chains are kept, was, as many authors state, the first which the Apostle Peter dedicated after his arrival in Rome,—and that hence it was called, subsequently, and before the chains were placed there, St. Peter's Church. He shows that the chains were, from the earliest period, held in high estimation in Rome. He does not, however, bring such testimony as would make evidence for the authenticity, unless we admit one or more of the miracles which he relates as wrought by their means; and one at least of these is sustained by testimony which to me appears fully sufficient; which makes direct and circumstantial evidence abundant for every person who has not made his determination to be incredulous. He avows that great difficulty and indistinctness is found in the testimony respecting the miraculous junction of the chains brought from Jerusalem and that with which the Apostle was bound in Rome; and states that he can find no evidence beyond an unsustained, and vague, and imperfect tradition. But respecting the bringing of one of the chains from Jerusalem to Rome, the testimony amounts to a very great probability, though by no means sufficient to produce certainty. The reading of the work has, upon the whole, produced in my mind the conclusion of the authenticity of the relic itself,—though I am not satisfied of the sufficiency of the proof by which it is sought to sustain several particular statements that are matters of pious belief. I look upon its preservation and exhibition to public respect to be not only rational and religious, but exceedingly useful to religion. I write from my own experience when I inform you that by it the understanding is enlightened, the heart is moved, the respectful recollection of the Apostle raises the soul to a still higher veneration for the commission with which he was invested, and of the faithful and painful discharge of whose duties this chain is an enduring witness; and he who contemplates the relic upon the altar, who misses that iron which enclosed the martyr's neck, bows in silent adoration, more resigned to the worldly and transient afflictions

which Providence allots to him, and the history of the saints is the justification of that Providence, which by some afflictions subjects to a penance in this transient state, and makes perfect by tribulation those who, enriched by grace, are found faithful and destined for glory. Who would not prefer to suffer upon earth, and to be glorious in heaven with Lazarus and with Peter, than to die like Dives or like Nero. The sumptuous repasts have long since ceased, the bright and delicate vesture has faded and decayed. The golden palace is a heap of ruin. Ages have flowed away, and eternity is yet, if I might use the expression, in the very infancy of its duration; sorrow is changed into joy, and the instrument of pain, and the badge of disgrace, has become the evidence of fidelity, as it was the occasion of merit, and continues to be the emblem of triumph, and the incitement to virtue. We feel the full force of that passage of the Apostle in which he says, that "God chooses the foolish things of the world that he might confound the wise—and the weak things of the world that he might confound the strong—and the ignoble things of the world, and the contemptible things of the world, did God choose, and the things that are not, that he might bring to naught the things that are, that no flesh should glory in his sight."

In this church is another of Guercino's pieces, which attracted my notice, and for a time riveted my attention more even upon the moral than upon the production of the artist. The altar over which it is placed is near that of the chains; St. Augustine, the great Bishop of Hippo, is finely represented in the mood of most intense investigation. In the features you at once perceive the deep research and the anxiety of inquiry; the eye would seem to penetrate beyond the sphere of his existence, and to scrutinize a world far, far beyond the scan of ordinary men. He is seated near the margin of the ocean; and a beautiful child, at a small distance from the prelate, seems to be equally intent upon his own occupation. He has a large shell with which he appears determined to draw off the waters of the ocean, and to pour them on the land.

The saint relates that one day, when endeavouring to form some idea of the nature of the infinite and eternal Creator, and led in his contemplations to try [to] find some objects of comparison, and to try [to] discern the mode of the Triune existence of the Almighty; after many a fruitless effort, he saw [that] a child thus occupied was the best emblem of an aspiring mortal who would endeavour, with his limited faculties, to grasp infinity! It reminded me of the solemn and

sublime address of the Lord himself to the wise, the patient, and the contemplative Eastern. (*Job* xxxviii.)

I have not yet done with this church. I like the dress of these canons regular; it is a white sutan of fine flannel, over which they wear a fine linen rochet, rather short, and in the streets they throw a black cloak over the rochet.

August 14.—A few days since, an *Invito sagro*, or invitation for religious purposes, was posted in the form of a proclamation by the cardinal-vicar throughout the city. In it the faithful were invited to go, on the evening of the three days previous to the Assumption, to the Church of St. Mary Major, to pray for the peace and prosperity of the church, and especially to avert the evils which seem to impend over Spain and Portugal. I am told that on Tuesday evening there was a very large concourse; on yesterday evening I went rather early, and stopped for a few moments at the Church of St. Lorenzo in Panisperna, which stands upon the spot where the martyrdom of St. Laurence took place. On my way from this to the basilic of St. Mary, I was overtaken by half a dozen of the juniors of the canons regular of Saint Peter's, who appeared to have conceived a friendship for me since they saw me taking notes in their church, and we proceeded together; the crowds were thronging the streets in all directions, hundreds of carriages were drawn up round the building. We went in and found it was but one-third filled; after remaining to pray for a time, we came out, and perceived the holy father at a distance. His carriage soon arrived, a dragoon, and at a short distance another, then about four or five, a carriage drawn by six horses, with the superior officers of the palace. The Pope's carriage, open on every side, drawn by six horses, the holy father praying for blessings on the people as he passed, and this enthusiastically responded to by them. The guards of nobles, two carriages drawn each by four horses, about twenty dragoons, two carriages drawn each by two horses, two dragoons. The cardinals received his holiness. The church was now thronged, and I never witnessed more devotion than amongst the crowd where I knelt. The usual prayers were gone through, and the benediction of the sacrament given by a canon. Upwards of ten thousand persons then separated.

LETTERS ON N. P. WILLIS'S[4] "FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF EUROPE"

[It may seem invidious to reproduce, after so long an interval, a series of letters in which one of our most agreeable and popular American anthors is somewhat severely, though courteously criticised. The offence of Mr. Willis, though perhaps personally a venial one, is nevertheless so common even among the most amiable and respectable writers of similar works, and involves in itself such great injustice, as well as such serious consequences of harm, towards those whose minds are in this way fatally prejudiced against the Roman Church, that no good opportunity can with propriety be let pass, in which something may be done to counteract the evil. It is often the case that persons, even those whose minds are partly imbued with Catholic doctrine, inquire with an appearance of the deepest earnestness and concern, what can be said against the grave charges made by so many writers of name against the Roman dignitaries and clergy. It is felt, on the one hand, that the mere fact that the Roman Hierarchy are such a body as it becomes the chief priests and ecclesiastical princes of the Catholic Church of Christ to be, would, if proved, constitute a powerful moral argument in favour of the high claims of the Roman See; and, on the other, that the absence of sanctity and virtue among them throws a fearful weight into the opposite scale. To those who have been themselves educated for the priesthood in Rome, or who have the advantage of deriving personal information from them, it appears almost an idle task to set seriously about the refutation of the ordinary charges against the Roman clergy. But to such as have not this advantage, the letter of one like Bishop England, whose competence and veracity as a witness are alike above suspicion, must be of great service, and will, it is hoped, be found amply sufficient; while they exhibit to all, and especially to such as feel called upon to write against our holy religion, an example of that dignity, courtesy, and Christian charity, which, in every Catholic prelate living in these times, is put to such severe and trying tests. The letters were first published in the *Baltimore Gazette*, and are extracted from the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, into which they were copied—Nos. 18-21 of Vol. XIII., for 1833.]

LETTER I

BALTIMORE, MD., Oct. 23, 1833.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette.

Sir:—Having upon my return from Europe, been told by some friends that a writer who has furnished the *New York Mirror* with articles under the head of *First Impressions of Europe*, had mentioned

[4] Nathanael Parker Willis was born in Portland, Me., in the year 1806, and died at Newburg, N. Y., in 1867. He was a polished, voluminous writer and widely read. In 1828 he published the *American Monthly Magazine*, which, two years after, was merged into the *New York Mirror*, the paper above mentioned by Bishop England.—ED.

a lecture delivered by me in Rome, in terms that appeared somewhat strange to them, I requested to be shown the passage; and the following paragraph in that paper, under date of September 7, was pointed out to me:—

"Bishop England, of Charleston, South Carolina, delivered a lecture at the house of the English Cardinal Weld, a day or two ago, explanatory of the ceremonies of the Holy Week. It was principally an apology for them. He confessed that to the educated, they appeared empty, and even absurd rites, but they were intended not for the refined, but for the vulgar, whom it was necessary to instruct and impress through their outward senses. As nearly all those rites, however, take place in the Sistine Chapel, which no person is permitted to enter who is not furnished with a ticket, and in full dress—his argument rather fell to the ground."

I shall premise to my other observations, that it affords me some relief to find the writer does not assert that he heard me; and therefore, though I should consider the passage to be a gross misrepresentation, I am not compelled to charge him with having deliberately published an untruth. He probably heard some one who was present, or some one who had heard from one that was present, notions of what I said, and then gave his own first impressions, hasty and imperfect as they were, instead of my explanation.

It would be folly for me to affect that I did not know the nature of what I delivered after mature reflection, upon which I consider an exceedingly important subject, at the request of an estimable and highly dignified cardinal, in the capital of the Christian world, to a select and specially invited company of several of the best informed members of the British and Irish nobility and gentry, and a number of my own respectable fellow-citizens; especially, when besides the ordinary motives which should influence any prelate so circumstanced, I had some very peculiar, to urge me to perform the duty in the best manner that I could. One of them, I will confess, was to secure as far as I could, that the land that adopted me should not suffer discredit by my negligence. Had some English tourist endeavoured to strike anything belonging to the United States, through my sides, I should feel less than I do. I avow that I did not imagine that any American then in Rome, would have been so thoughtless.

I had previous to delivering the three lectures (not a lecture), written after some considerable study, an explanation of the Ceremonies of the Mass, and those of the Holy Week, consisting of about three hundred pages in duodecimo, and this little book was then actually in the course of publication. I was therefore fully prepared upon the subject. I conversed after each lecture with several exceedingly intelligent Protestants and Catholics; for the double purpose of as-

certaining what were their impressions respecting the elucidations that had been given, and the topics of which it was desirable still to treat. With them I spoke freely, and had their sentiments with a becoming candour. I feel competent then to state at least, the nature of my lectures, and assure you that nothing can be more unlike what they really were than is the description given by the correspondent of the *Mirror*. Yet he has caught some of my ideas—perhaps even some of my expressions—but has altogether distorted my explanation.

If vindicatory elucidation, following a brief apologetic introduction, be "principally an apology," then is that writer correct—for in such a way have I betrayed my place, belied my conscience, and deceived my friends. I did say that *sometimes even* to the educated the ceremonial *might* appear empty, and to the refined abstract philosopher it might seem absurd, because the form would be considered useless: but that the observances were calculated, when duly understood at all events to impress usefully the great bulk of mankind, who did not enjoy such opportunities of mental cultivation as did the audience I then had the honour of addressing—and that even for the educated and refined, they would, I was convinced, be of the greatest advantage however extensive might be their knowledge, and cultivated their taste; because by those means the understanding was informed—they wrought upon the will and engaged the affections. I did show that the principle they involved was that upon which were based the rites instituted by the Almighty, when he gave his revelations to Moses in the desert—upon which Solomon acted subsequently in the application of science and arts, under the guidance of inspiration. And by a variety of similar topics I showed that by judicious impressions upon the senses, (I am not aware that I found it necessary to introduce the word *outward*,) the sage and the simpleton, the philosopher and the child might be equally induced to practice virtue, and to cultivate religion.

I was quite aware, it is true, that a large portion of the rites took place in the Sistine Chapel, of which I have the honour of being a member; and of course I know that being a papal chapel, and the private place of worship of his holiness and his attendants, not a public or parochial church, the etiquette required for admittance was that of a court. But if that writer were sufficiently informed upon the subject of which he treated, he would have been fully aware, that the religious ceremonial which I explained, though observed in the papal chapel, was not confined thereto, but might be seen with more or less solemnity in every Catholic church of the Latin rite, from China to California, from Siberia to Cape Horn. Had he known this, he would have per-

ceived that what he instituted as my argument would not have "rather fallen to the ground." Had he known this, when he wrote as he did, what shall be said of his veracity? Had he been present at my lectures, he could not have been without the knowledge. I must, sir, request of you as an act of kindness not to me, but to the religion which has bestowed upon so undeserving an individual so many favours, to give to your readers my protest against a paragraph which contains at least as many incorrect averments as it does lines. I trust also that the editor of the *Mirror* will, as an act of justice to that religion, be induced to insert this and a few other communications, which I shall endeavour to make upon the subject of the *First Impressions,* should my leisure permit. I am sir, your obedient,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER II

BALTIMORE, MD., Oct. 26, 1833.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette.

Sir:—I find in the *New York Mirror* of September 21st, another passage, on which I shall take leave to remark. It is the description which the writer of the *First Impressions of Europe* gives of his presentation at the Papal Court:—

"I have been presented to the Pope this morning, in company with several Americans—Mrs. and Mrs. Gray, of Boston, Mr. Atherton and daughters, and Mr. Walsh, of Philadelphia, and Mr. Meyer, of Baltimore. With the latter gentleman, I arrived rather late, and found that the rest of the party had been already received, and that His Holiness was giving audience, at the moment, to some Russian ladies of rank. Bishop England, of Charleston, however, was good enough to send in once more, and, in the course of a few minutes, the chamberlain in waiting announced to us the *Il Padre Santo* would receive us. The ante-room was a picturesque and rather peculiar scene. Clusters of priests, of different ranks, were scattered about in the corners, dressed in a variety of splendid costumes, white, crimson, and ermine; one or two monks, with their picturesque beards and flowing dresses of gray or brown, were standing near one of the doors, in their habitually humble attitudes; two gentlemen, mace-bearers, guarded the doors of the entrance to the Pope's presence, their silver batons under their arms, and their open-breasted cassocks covered with fine lace; the deep bend of the window was occupied by the American party of ladies, in the required black veils, and around the outer door stood the helmeted guard, a dozen stout men-at-arms, forming a forcible contrast to the mild faces and priestly company within.

"The mace-bearers lifted the curtain, and the Pope stood before us, in a small plain room. The Irish priest who accompanied us prostrated himself on the floor, and kissed the embroidered slipper, and Bishop England hastily knelt and kissed his hand, turning to present us as he rose. His Holiness smiled, and stepped forward, with a gesture of his hand, as if to prevent our kneeling, and, as the bishop

mentioned our names, he looked up at us. Whether he presumed we did not speak the language, or whether he thought us too young to answer ourselves, he confined his inquiries about us entirely to the good bishop, leaving me, as I had wished, at leisure to study his features and manner. It was easy to conceive that the father of the Catholic Church stood before me, but I could scarcely realize that it was a sovereign of Europe, and the temporal monarch of millions. He was dressed in a long vesture of snow-white flannel, buttoned together in front, with a large crimson cape over his shoulders, and band and tassels of silver cloth hanging from beneath. A small skull cap covered the crown of his head, and his hair, slightly grizzled, fell straight towards a low forehead, expressive of good nature merely. A large emerald on his finger, and slippers wrought in gold, with a cross on the instep, completed his dress.—His face is heavily moulded, but unmarked, and expressive mainly of sloth and kindness; his nose is uncommonly large—rather pendant than prominent, and an incipient double chin, slightly hanging cheeks, and eyes, over which the lids drop, as if in sleep, at the end of every sentence, confirm the general impression of his presence—that of an indolent and good old man. His inquiries were principally of the Catholic church in Baltimore, (mentioned by the bishop as the city of Mr. Meyer's residence,) of its processions, its degree of state, and whether it was recognized by the government. At the first pause in the conversation, His Holiness smiled and bowed, the Irish priest prostrated himself again and kissed his foot; and, with a blessing from the father of the Church, we retired."

Each individual must be the exclusive witness of his own impressions. The correspondent of the *Mirror* has published those which he says he had regarding Pope Gregory XVI., and gives his character in the phrase "indolent and good old man." The particulars of the holy father's appearance are described in such a way as to sustain the general correctness of the drawing which is exhibited. The writer had ample opportunity and full leisure, as he states himself, "to study his features and manner"—and the result of that study is, the conclusion that the face was "expressive mainly of sloth and kindness"—and in viewing him "it was easy to conceive that the father of the Catholic Church stood before" the spectator.

These are given as the *first impressions* of the writer, but it is rather unfortunate, that not only are they very different from those which I entertained, but also from those which, if my recollection serves me, were, immediately after the presentation, communicated to me by the writer himself.

I am neither disposed to quarrel with the correspondent of the *Mirror* for his painting, nor to say that his impressions were what I think he formerly expressed, and not what he now describes; but I shall take the liberty of stating some facts within my own knowledge, for the purpose of enabling your readers to decide how far the pontiff deserves the character of being indolent and slothful.

His ordinary hour of rising is about four o'clock in the morning,

at all seasons of the year. He devotes to private religious exercises, such as prayer, meditation, the celebration of Mass, and spiritual reading, nearly three hours. At seven o'clock he commences his audiences of the secretary of state, and other officers employed in the temporal government of his states. In this laborious occupation several hours are daily consumed. He takes no breakfast; but occasionally a cup of coffee—of which beverage he is extremely fond—is brought to him as a refreshment.

When this duty has been discharged by his giving decisions and directions, either some of his own subjects are received upon business, or foreigners are presented;—and thus some more time is occupied. His Holiness has no fixed time for dinner, which is his only meal; but when the press of business subsides, he takes alone an exceedingly plain and moderate refection. The estimate of expenses for this dinner, including wines, fruit, and so forth, would be too high at five dollars the week. After a short rest, and some time devoted to prayer, the holy father walks for an hour in his gardens; on which occasion some of the principal foreigners of distinction, who have been previously presented, are upon special leave permitted to introduce to him the ladies of their family. At about five o'clock in the afternoon, he proceeds to his cabinet to receive the prefects or secretaries of the several congregations of ecclesiastical affairs, foreign prelates, and others with whom he has business relating to the Church. He is generally occupied with them until after eight o'clock; not unfrequently until nine. His evening devotions must then be attended to, previously to his retiring for the night.

The above order is indeed often interfered with by the necessity of his presiding at congregations of cardinals and prelates, upon special and important extraordinary cases of ecclesiastical business, as also of his presiding at consistories, where the whole body of cardinals assemble to deliberate on some weighty affair, relating sometimes to the government of his states, sometimes to the general concerns of the church: he is moreover required on solemn occasions to attend at the grand ceremonies of the church, on the principal festivals; and sometimes too, though seldom indeed, does he break from this laborious routine, in order to ride or walk a few miles into the country, to inhale a more pure air, and to unbend a mind drawn to its utmost pitch, by such close application to the most important concerns of millions for this world, and of myriads for the next. This is indeed but a slight indulgence for one, who, in his sixty-ninth year, is pressed upon so heavily by the concerns of eternity! Occasionally, when the weather

will not permit his excursion or his walk in the garden, the father of the faithful may be found viewing, in his moments of relaxation, those glorious productions of nature and of art, with which the magnificent galleries of the Vatican are filled. No one surely would reproach him for such occupation of a moment thus given to restore the elasticity of his mind; unless, perhaps, we might be able to resuscitate the man who was scandalized at discovering St. John the Evangelist occupied with a hawk, as the companion and object of his mental relaxation.

Your readers will now determine how far sloth and indolence enter into the character of the head of the church.

I have never measured the forehead of his holiness, nor that of his American portrait painter; but if my recollection be accurate, that of Pope Gregory XVI. is at least some dozen lines higher than that of the writer who described him in the *Mirror;* this latter, besides the advantage of a sweet countenance, possesses a sufficiently bold front.

I have had opportunities of transacting, more or less, business with several very eminent men of different stations of life, on both sides of the Atlantic, and trust that I shall not be thought arrogant in saying that I can form some idea of the manner in which it should be gone through. After having had the honour of several times seeing His Holiness, I do not hesitate to assert that few, if any, of those that I met, are better men of business. There is a clearness of comprehension, an accuracy of judgment, a precision of manner, and a promptness of decision, that I have seldom found combined, united in him to a peculiar mildness and cheerfulness of manner, together with a plain open honesty of purpose which wins a confidence that is safely reposed. Previously to his having been elevated to the papal chair, he, as a Benedictine monk and consultor of the Propaganda, had performed frequent laborious and useful services—often under intricate and delicate circumstances. Subsequently he was Cardinal Capellari, and had been raised to the prefecture of the Propaganda, in which station he gave general satisfaction in his transaction if important business with several nations of Europe, Asia, America, and some few stations in Africa. I have thought it proper to exhibit these facts, in order to show how grossly the correspondent of the *Mirror* erred in his estimate of the Pontiff's character and habits.

A circumstance, trivial in itself, will often show the value of testimony better than the more striking facts. To me, nothing is more manifest than that the writer for the *Mirror* gives his sketches at least as much from imagination as from view, because of a seemingly unimportant statement in his description. The day on which I presented

him to the Pope, was the Saturday after Easter Sunday. My rècollection on this is positive and distinct, and is sustained by his own statement, which places the occurrence after the Holy Week. It was on the last day on which a papal chapel was held at the Sistine chapel, at the termination of the Easter week. This, of course, was during the pascal time, when the Pope is clothed altogether in white. Yet this writer, who was at such complete leisure to study his person, his portrait and his dress, flings "a large crimson cape over his shoulders." It is true, that on other occasions he saw the holy father so clad, but decidedly such was not the case on that day, nor for the previous week.

If the writer's object was to follow in the usual fashionable mode of undervaluing, for the depraved taste of any set of readers, the high dignitaries of the Catholic Church, he should at least have had the honesty to decline asking favours from those whom he intended to misrepresent. It is not generous to seek for a boon to be employed against the donor; and in receiving Mr. Meyer and that writer, the holy father not only departed from the etiquette of his court, but detained the governor of Rome, the principal assistant at the throne, and several officers who were expecting audiences on business, together with the whole body of attendants, described by the writer himself as in waiting, during the time that the audience lasted.

Two parties of strangers had been noted for presentation on that day immediately after Mass, in the rooms behind the Sistine chapel. The first consisted of some Russian princesses and their attendants, the second of the Americans, of whom the correspondent of the *Mirror* was one. I could not find either Mr. Meyer or the writer at the close of the Mass, and waited with those who attended in one of the anterooms, until the master of ceremonies called for the Bishop of Charleston and the Americans first, which was a compliment that I did not expect. As I wished to have some friend who spoke Italian more fluently than I could, I requested of the Reverend Doctor Cullen, rector of the Irish college, and superintendent of the printing establishment of the *Propaganda,* an humble and erudite scholar, especially versed in oriental languages and ancient literature, to accompany us. He is a great favourite with the Pope, and was of course exceedingly acceptable. After our audience, the Russian ladies were admitted, and I found Mr. Meyer and his companion in the ante-room. I was told by the major-domo, that it was quite out of order to ask for a second audience then; and I knew that very urgent and important business waited the Pope's examination; yet as I saw the disappointment would be great if these gentlemen were not admitted, I did prevail upon

an officer to make the request, just as the Russian ladies were retiring. I succeeded, and prevailed upon "the Irish priest" to acompany us. The interview with his holiness was, of course, not very long. Mr. Meyer did converse with the Pope, told him that, though not a Catholic, he had received a portion of his education in Baltimore, at the College of St. Mary's, of which he spoke in very grateful terms. The Pope expressed pleasure at this statement, and then remarked to me, as we had previously conversed on the subject, that he understood with gratification, the Protestants of Baltimore and the Legislature of Maryland, had latterly acted with great kindness towards the Catholics, and that there was full liberty not only for the profession, but even for the public performance of the ceremonies of religion; upon which I told his holiness that I had seen, making due allowance for numbers, as well regulated a procession in the streets of Baltimore as in Rome; and Mr. Meyer stated, that he had joined in a procession at St. Mary's. As there was much business, the holy father, after a few other remarks, made his bow, and we retired. From the observations which were made in the ante-room, I must own I thought that the person from whom they emanated was incapable of writing the passages upon which I have thus made a comment.

I am, sir, your ob't,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER III

BALTIMORE, MD., Oct. 30, 1833.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette.

Sir:— I beg leave to make a few remarks upon the following exceedingly offensive paragraphs, found in No. 58 of the *First Impressions of Europe*. It is in the *New York Mirror*, of Sept. 7th.

"Two or three hours after, I was at a crowded *soiree*, at one of the noble houses of Rome. A *prima donna*, from the opera was singing in one room, and card tables covered with gold and silver, filled three others, and every second player was a dignitary of the church, in dainty pumps, and gold snuff-box, and jewelled fingers, complimenting and flirting with all the bright eyes and merry faces around him. The penitential *miserere* passed through my mind, and the thick iron grates, through which alone ladies are allowed to witness the ceremonies of the chapel! I passed on to a pretty silken boudoir, at the end of the long suite of apartments, and was welcomed by the handsomest man in Rome, a priest, and the son of a wealthy and noble family, who was half reclining upon the cushion of a divan, and playing with the scarf of one of the loveliest women of the society here, while two others endeavoured to draw him into conversation. I could not help continuing my reflection, and contrasting this clerical dandy, with his handsome black curls, redolent of per-

fumed oils, his buckles of chased silver, his Parisian gloves, with a large emerald worn outside, and his attitude and employment of mere pleasure, with the ministers of a religion professing the same master, in our own country. There are, of course, priests in Rome who are sufficiently humble in dress and manner, but nothing can exceed the sumptuousness and style in which the cardinals live, as well as all who, from birth and fortune, have a certain personal consequence. Their carriages and horses are the most splendid in the world, their large palaces swarm with servants, and their dress has all the richness of that of princes, when they are abroad. One can scarce see their scarlet caps, scarlet carriages and trappings, scarlet robes and stockings, without remembering a certain 'lady of Babylon.' ''

I might despatch this entire passage by marking its description in the shortest and most expressive words of the English language; and, but for the respect which I owe to the place I fill, and to your readers, probably such would be the most appropriate mode. I shall, however, examine his credibility by a critical process.

The writer asserts that he went to the *soiree* which he describes within two or three hours after having left the Sistine chapel, where he attended at the *Tenebræ* or Holy Tuesday. I find this day mentioned in the caption, *Bishop England's Lecture, Holy Tuesday, the Miserere, and so forth;* again in the narrative—"I went to the chapel on Holy Tuesday, to hear the far-famed *Miserere.*" Knowing that no ceremony takes place on Tuesday, and that as every Catholic is aware, the *Tenebræ* and *Miserere*, and so forth, are only on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, I supposed the mistake to be that of the printer, who gave us Tuesday for Thursday; but upon reviewing the paper I perceived that this could not be the case; for in the succeeding paragraph we have the description of the ceremonies of Thursday. Of course the writer has given us a day upon which the Sistine chapel is closed, and is thus clearly so negligent as not to be quite a safe authority upon which to rest an exceedingly grave charge. The mistake of the day would under other circumstances be a matter of no moment, if the fact which he describes had really occurred; but my object is to show that it did not occur; that what he paints is from imagination. I am by no means disposed to deny his merits as a poet, and in this place give him full credit for possessing one of the essential qualities of the children of Parnassus; he has the power of fiction; but whether that power has been used with the discretion recommended by the master of the art, I shall leave to the reader's judgment—

Aut famam sequere, aut sibi convenientia finge.

The writer asserts that he was at this *soiree* "at one of the noble houses of Rome," about two or three hours after he came from the *Tenebræ* in the Sistine chapel. He has given us a wrong day, let that pass. No persons on earth are more correct in their close observance

of etiquette—none more precise in adhering to established custom, than the Roman nobility and gentry—and no fact is more notorious in Rome, than that holding a *soiree* during the week—especially on the evening of either of the days of *Tenebræ,* would be the grossest outrage upon public decency. It would be of itself sufficient to place the person so offending in an exceedingly awkward position in society. But were it possible for any one to be guilty of this trespass, any dignitary of the church, who on either of those evenings would so far forget his place as to attend, would expose himself to severe censure. The occurrence could not have taken place without making such noise, especially among the members of the papal chapel in which those dignitaries have a place, that I must have heard it; I was in the midst of them continually during those days, and I remained nearly two months afterwards in the city, and though I did hear of all, or almost all the *soirees* at the noble houses, and had cards, I believe, for every one of them, though I scarcely went to any, yet the first I learned of one of those assemblies in the holy week, was from the writer who misrepresented my own lectures, made degrading and unjustifiable insinuations against the Pope, had the *Tenebræ* in the Sistine chapel on Holy Tuesday, and caused one of the noble families of Rome, and many of the dignitaries of the church to violate the most sacred customs of the city, in the most solemn week in the year.

I have the honour of being acquainted with some clergymen belonging to those families, and I know not anywhere more exemplary men. Did the discipline of Rome permit to any priest the dandyism here described, I believe no men in the body of the Roman clergy would be less disposed to indulge in it than the priests who are members of the noble families. I know one of them who is a canon of the Lateran basilic, who is certainly one of the handsomest, as he is amongst the most virtuous men I have met with; but so far from being the criminal fop here described, he is one of the most humble, modest, and regular observers of the salutary discipline of the church, and the unbecoming position of the half-reclining priest, is as contrary to that discipline, as it would be to hold such an assembly on any evening of the *Tenebræ.* On other occasions, at other times, the dignitaries and other clergy might be met with at those evening assemblies, but I write from observation and after reflection when I will assert, that having myself gone and seen, and heard from others upon whose judgment I rely, that, taken as a body, there does not exist a more correct, and upright, and moral body of men, than that portion of our clergy which this writer would defame, viz., the clergy of the city of Rome.

Perhaps a few remarks upon what I have myself seen, will be the most correct mode of disabusing such of your readers as might have been misled by this very thoughtless and flippant writer. And if I am thus forced to introduce a little of my own history, I trust that introduction will not be imputed to any desire, save that which I really feel, of giving a simple view of fact, to place in its proper light the conduct of men who at the distance of five thousand miles, are, in a language which they do not understand, arraigned and condemned without a hearing before a people who, because of circumstances not under their control, are predisposed to their condemnation.

During my stay at Rome, I was closely occupied with important business. Frequently, I have been for five or six days chained, if I may use the expression, to my desk, from before daylight to an advanced hour of the night, with scarcely any interruption for meals hastily taken; when some friend urged upon me the necessity of a little relaxation, and insisted upon my accompanying him for a couple of hours to one of those *soirees* which are, during a considerable portion of the year, held almost every evening. It afforded the best opportunity of seeing my compatriots in the city, of meeting and conversing with respectable persons from every nation, and afforded [a] great variety of [opportunities for] unbending the mind. More than once has it happened to me that an occasion was thus found of obtaining, without official formality, much information from high functionaries, not only of Rome, but of foreign states. On some of those occasions the most serious business is transacted in the midst of a room where everything appears to the frivolous to be frivolity.

I have, on several occasions, been deeply engaged on business with a cardinal who had been, if possible, more deeply and incessantly occupied than I had myself been; and whom I had often twice or thrice called upon before I could get an opportunity to have my business taken up. When we were both weary, and both invited, he sometimes proposed that we should avail ourselves of the invitation, and if we could not conclude our consultation on the way, that we should find some opportunity of resuming it in the rooms, or return at an early hour for its termination. I know, therefore, by my own experience, that the greater number of the "dignitaries of the church" who are found at those evening parties, are not as idle as was their critic. That they are men whose minds have been intensely occupied during the day, and who need the relaxation which those assemblies offer, but who even there do not always obtain it.

The writer represents them as in large numbers, gambling for

quantities of gold and silver. I will say, it is true I have sometimes observed a few of them seated at a card table, and observed money on that table, but the insinuation that the numbers were great, is incorrect; and the other, that they played for money, was not true in any one instance that fell under my observation, though I have seen the gold and silver used as what I was told were called "markers," the nature of which, I must avow, I do not well know. There are various tastes, and mine is not for card playing, though I am of opinion that it is not gambling when there is no stake; it is not, it is true, an amusement exactly to the taste of our own country. But we have as little right to force our tastes and habits upon the Italians, as they have to compel us to theirs.

I know not what right this critic has to ridicule the fashions of a people who received him with hospitality, and treated him with unmerited attention. The dignitaries of the church, whether Romans or foreigners, are, on all public occasions, obliged to wear the dress appropriate to their rank; to appear without it, would be to insult the company, and would seem to be a desertion of their place. If rings and buckles are a portion of this costume, the wearing of them is, I presume, neither a violation of the law of God, nor a transgression of the principles of politeness. The curls redolent of perfumed oils, the chasing of the silver, and wearing a large emerald outside the glove in these apartments, are as completely at variance with all that I have known or heard of, or know to be usual, as are the silken boudoir, and the "flirting of dignitaries of the church, with all the bright eyes and merry faces around them." Gloves are indeed worn, and I had myself a pair, and would not vouch that they were not Parisian; so, perhaps, were the gloves of my brethren. Taken in all its parts, or as a whole, a more wantonly offensive paragraph, one more destitute of truth, could not easily be found than this which I now examine.

The nature of these Roman *soirees* is altogether different from any that I believe exist in the United States, or perhaps from any others in the world. It is true that all the company, consisting of some hundreds, meet in one palace, but they, in fact, form several parties. Five, six, sometimes even ten large rooms are occupied. In one, the youth and beauty and fashion of various nations may be found; in another, the diplomatists and politicians of several countries; in the next, the literary, the clerical, the aged, but in every room some of all. Music is occasionally introduced, but the *prima donna* from the opera in Rome, is not the same as she of London, of Paris, or of some other capitals. I shall take another opportunity of drawing the distinction

between the morality of Rome and of other parts of Italy, and the criminality of many of the be-praised cities. And if a professional singer is sometimes found at those assemblies, she is one whose moral character is as pure as is that of the ladies by whom she is surrounded, and with whom she associates; and what she sings is as inoffensive to the ear of chastity, for the purity of the sentiment, as it is acceptable for the excellence of its execution.

The idle gossip which cannot be excluded, forms indeed a portion of the chat in some of the circles, but in others the man of science, the lawyer, the diplomatist, the clergyman, and the gentleman of observation, will find ample opportunity of improvement. Yet the "dignitaries of the church" spend comparatively a short time at those assemblies. When present, their conduct is as becoming as is their dress; they retire early; and dancing, which sometimes closes the *soirees,* never commences until after they have retired. To this I have known only one exception, and this in a palace where the splendid dancing-hall is so distant from the rooms in which they are found, that even the sound of the music cannot reach them.

I have known some of my friends, who were not well acquainted with Rome, fall into a mistake from the benefit of which this writer has precluded himself. The similarity of dress led them to confound some classes of lawyers and officers, with priests and bishops. It is a mistake to which every stranger is at first liable. The writer of this paragraph cannot avail himself of this plea. The characteristics of fiction are too many, and too well defined. He wrote for a purpose, and that purpose is manifest.

I have said nothing of the cardinal and their scarlet, but I must describe them in my next.

I am, sir, your obedient,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IV

BALTIMORE, MD., NOV. 4, 1833.

To the Editor of the Baltimore Gazette.

Sir:—I promised in my last letter to send you some remarks occasioned by the following passage in the *First Impressions of Europe.*

"There are, of course, priests in Rome who are sufficiently humble in dress and manner, but nothing can exceed the sumptuousness and style in which the cardinals live, as well as all who, from birth or fortune, have a certain personal consequence. Their carriages and horses are the most splendid in the world, their large

palaces swarm with servants, and their dress has all the richness of that of princes when they are abroad. One can scarcely see their scarlet caps, scarlet carriages and trappings, scarlet robes and stockings, without remembering a certain 'lady of Babylon.' ''

The insinuation of the writer is manifestly that the great portion of the clergy in Rome are not humble either in dress or manner. And further, that the want of these virtues in the cardinals, justifies the application to their body of an exceedingly offensive epithet. The colour of portions of their dress and equipage, is said to render the application more correct; and the innuendo is palpable, that the church to which they belong is anti-Christian.

I shall not enter into a theological disquisition upon the claims which that church may have to so distinguished a title. The dress of our clergy is quite a matter of taste; I shall not contend that it either produces, or excludes, or indicates humility. As regards the manner of the Roman clergy, I can only testify my own "impressions;" first and last, I have never met a more respectable, a better educated, a more pious, a more truly polite body of men. I cannot enter into their souls; but they are either very humble, or they are the most consummate hypocrites that ever existed.

The writer who charges them with so much criminality had no opportunity of knowing them; I was in the habit of almost daily intercourse with them for several months. Many of my earliest acquaintances and friends in the land of my birth had lived in Rome, and spent several years in that city; I met them when I arrived there, and their testimony corresponds with my impressions. With these remarks I shall leave your readers to decide for themselves.

I shall now inform you of the manner in which the greater number of our travellers acquire their notions of Roman clergy, of cardinals, of Roman laws and Roman customs. I shall give you my own history as the best mode of leading you into "the secret."

On my way to Rome I wore what is called the secular dress, that is, not the peculiar garb of a clergyman. I was easily known to be a foreigner, and generally from my imperfect knowledge of the language, and a variety of little tokens which an Italian will easily detect, I was considered to be English, which is a generic term for all whose vernacular tongue is that language, be they English, Scotch, Irish, or American. I conversed with some of the guides, with travellers, and with others, and most universally, I was told extraordinary histories of the clergy; their pride, their misconduct, their avarice, their tyranny. The cardinals came in for no small share of the imputations. I went

into Rome fully impressed with the notion there must be a considerable share of truth in the statements; for that it was impossible that all I heard could be fiction. I began soon to ask some of those friends whom I met in the city concerning the truth of what I had heard, and really began to suspect that they were, through a pious lenity, endeavouring to palliate or deny what I believed to be true.

They told me that one of the most amusing occupations the cicerones had, was to recount to each other the manner in which they imposed upon the English credulity, by the most extravagant tales. They always were anxious to give as much of the most grateful food as he could take, to a good gull, from whom they expected ample employment, and "John Bull," as they called him, was always quite disposed to feast upon the scandals of the clergy, and the tyranny of the government: wherefore, as such foul offal seemed to be the most agreeable to his palate, an abundant supply was always provided. This did not satisfy me. My friends then told me that my own observation would be sufficient; and that they would leave me to that and to time. I have been, indeed, effectually disabused, not only by my acquaintance with the body that was calumniated, but by other means.

In Rome this disposition to gratify a bad taste is not confined to the mere cicerone; there are men who desire to be on good terms with the English, and to supply them with antiquities, whether ancient or modern is of little moment; there are the connoisseurs in the fine arts, who can procure for them a painting worth twenty crowns if it was clean, for two or three hundred because it is dirty; there are brokers; there are libereaux, and several others; there are men who are too polite, and men who are too politic to contradict you in a favourite theory. And this is the society into which most of our travellers are thrown. And thus they receive their "first impressions of Europe." So that, in fact, all the falsehoods which they produce are not fictions of their own imaginations.

I could relate several instances where some of the worthy cicerones contradicted their own statement to myself, and apologized for their first assertions, when, after having been better able to detect them, I occasionally laid aside my ecclesiastical costume, and in an ordinary secular dress, made an excursion in which it was necessary to employ one of those veracious declaimers. I enjoyed an opportunity of which the critic of our cardinals could not partake. I saw and examined both sides; he could not.

I shall now give a brief sketch of the constitution of the college of cardinals, and of their occupation. There exists, I believe, a very

general mistake in this country regarding the employment of a dignitary of the Catholic Church. The ordinary routine of clerical duties is supposed to be the only occupation in which he is, or ought to be, engaged. Preaching a sermon, performing the service of the church, and the administration of the sacraments, visiting the sick, and burying the dead. Now, though this outline comprises much of the duty of a parochial clergyman and his assistants, yet these are not the occupations of a dignitary of the church, much less of a cardinal. They are the most important, and the most honourable, and the most useful occupations; but there are others which are also necessary, and which are the peculiar duty of that body of the clergy that the writer of the "first impressions" principally assails.

Where men are associated for any purpose, organization is necessary; and some sort of government is absolutely required for preserving this government so organized. The administration of this society is the special duties of the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church; they are of various grades, and the distribution of power is made according to their several stations. Frequently the person who appears least in public, is he upon whom the most important duty devolves, and who has the most laborious occupation. Again, let it be observed, that in every organized body in which strict discipline is to be preserved, the common sense of mankind has discovered, and the experience of ages upholds the observation, that a certain etiquette is essential for preserving the due respect to office. Hence the forms of our courts of justice, of our legislative assemblies; the distinction in the uniforms and attendants of our officers in the army and navy. Destroy this formality and you create such confusion as will perpetually thwart all their operations, and ultimately render the officer powerless, thereby putting an end to the government itself.

The Roman Catholic church numbers in its bosom upwards of one hundred and fifty millions, perhaps I would not far exceed the fact if I wrote two hundred millions, of human beings, spread through all the nations of the earth. This vast body is under a single ecclesiastical government. Rome is its capital; the Pope is its president; he holds the primacy of honour and of jurisdiction over this immense body, by the institution of Jesus Christ himself. From every nation under heaven, every day in the year, questions and cases relating to the discipline, or doctrine, or exigencies of that body, are to be examined and decided in this capital. These questions and cases are distributed to various tribunals, composed of dignitaries of that church; their reports are made to the holy father, who has also as his councillors

the body of the cardinals. One or more of these eminent men are to be found presiding over each of the courts or tribunals in which the ecclesiastical concerns of Christendom are reviewed or determined, and on great emergencies, or cases of difficulty, or important questions, or new cases, the whole body is assembled in consistory to advise before a determination is taken.

At all times there are to be found in the city prelates, or learned and experienced ecclesiastics, from every region of the globe; who are consulted, when it might be necessary, for the purpose of having accurate information upon the questions which are to be solved. In all these tribunals a precise form, which greatly aids the despatch of business, is observed; and the members who compose them, as well as their officers, are regulated upon the principles to which I have alluded, not only in their dress, but even in their equipages, so that the proper accommodation might be afforded to each according to his rank, and the proper respect paid, not only by each to the other, but also by minor officers, the attendants, the servants, and the guards.

In a limited court, where every one is known, and where all speak the same language, little if any difficulty could arise from the omission of this formality; but it is quite otherwise where there are hundreds of dignitaries, many of them from distant nations, whose language is wholly unintelligible to the attendants; frequently their residence is but for a few months; their business, perhaps, only that of a day. But by this regulation of dress and equipage, their rank is instantly known, their places are immediately pointed out, their authority at once recognised, unnecessary delay and interminable confusion are altogether prevented.

The cardinals are not only the councillors of his holiness in ecclesiastical concerns, but they are also his advisers in the temporal government [of] his domains. In the vacancy of the pontifical throne, they are the sovereign body of the Roman government. They rank, therefore, in civil concerns, as princes of the blood do in European monarchies. If, then, they appear abroad as princes, they have no discretion upon this head; the custom of the country, the will of the people, the law of the land, require it; that law prescribes what they must observe; the treasury furnishes the sum necessary for this purpose, to be expended in this way, they have no discretion: they cannot omit this mode in order to apply it to any other object.

The cardinals are men who have in general attained their eminence by long and laborious services. They are the representatives of the three orders of the hierarchy—six cardinal-bishops, fifty cardinal-priests,

and fourteen cardinal-deacons. The college is not always full. Whatever may be the merits or the talents of any other body of men in the universe, I could have no hesitation for an instant to place this assembly by its side; and whether upon the ground of capacity, of experience, of information, of industry, or of virtue, or of all united, to claim a favourable award from every impartial and capable judge.

The larger number of them have in their youth been consultors or judges in those ecclesiastical tribunals to which I have alluded; selected for their talents, their information, their prudence and integrity, they have risen from post to post. Many of them have presided in the civil departments of the state, and received their promotion as the reward of tried worth, and to secure the continuance of their services. A very great number have been employed at the principal courts and capitals of the world as nuncios or legates of the Holy See; they have a thorough knowledge of the principal statesmen and high functionaries, of the most learned men and best prelates, from actual observation. Others are the prelates most distinguished in the other principal nations of Europe, for their erudition, their piety and high standing. Some, indeed, are members of noble families, possessing great wealth, counting up a long series of ancestors distinguished for their personal qualities, and whose names are identified with some of the most interesting facts of history. Yet not one of these men has been raised to the cardinalate merely because of his family greatness; he has uniformly decorated that at least by his virtues. In this body are found the protectors of science, the patrons of the arts, the promoters of piety, the founders of colleges, of hospitals, and of those other institutions which alleviate the distress and promote the happiness of man. The constitution of the body exhibits the sources from which are drawn the mass of excellence which it contains.

If there be something of aristocracy in its composition, it is perhaps that species of which even a republic might to some extent approve. No one is admitted by descent, by hereditary claim; if dignity is conferred, it is only upon the individual, and for his personal merits. It is open for the son of the peasant equally as for the son of the prince. If the Dorias, the Pamphilis, the Justinianis, the Matteis, the Albanis, and such like be found upon the list, the Micaras, the Salas, and others raised by their own merits from the humblest rank, are also high upon it. If the antiquarian, the painter, the poet or the sculptor, are asked who are their best protectors, they will tell you Fesch, Galeffi, and Weld: the philosopher will claim Zurla. The memoirs of the venerable Pacca, the dean of the sacred college, will exhibit the tact of the statesman,

the erudition of the scholar, the sufferings of the martyr, and the fidelity of patriotic heroism. Lambruschini and Spinola stand deservedly respected for their correct diplomacy. Bernetti is looked upon as worthy of the mantle of Consalvi, which has fallen upon his shoulders. Pedicini and Odeschalchi are the enlightened patrons and patterns of elevated piety and the regularity of discipline. I find I am carried away, but I must stop, otherwise I should write every name upon the list.

The principle of their elevation, then, is that which the present emperor of Austria expressed, when some of his nobles insinuated their surprise that instead of recommending one of the members of his nobility, who are to be found in numbers, and many of them very exemplary, amongst the clergy of his dominions, to be raised to the archiepiscopal see of Vienna, he had the son of a bookbinder placed in that Cathedral, and created a Prince of the Empire. "I cannot raise a Prince to be an Apostle, but I can make an Apostle a Prince." If the splendour and richness of the cardinals' appearance in public be great, numbers of them have inherited the means by which that exhibition is sustained, and refuse to accept from the public purse the allowance which is appropriated for its support; others would, in any state of society, have by their merits obtained a similar rank: others in the midst of this external show follow in their private life, the poverty and mortification which they vowed as members of the strictest orders of religion; and if they ride in splendid carriages in Rome, for the purpose of conforming to the etiquette which is so essential, they have traversed Italy on foot with only their breviaries in their hands, making its churches resound with the eloquence which converted the sinner, and encouraged the saint. Their occupations to-day are even more laborious than they were then; they and their brethren are overwhelmed with the business which I have before described; their desks are covered with documents of importance in all the languages of the earth; in the examination of these they may be found before day breaks, and long after it has closed. And if they go out, in state, to their assemblies, or to the great ceremonial of the Church, it is but in obedience to laws which have for their object, not the gratification of vanity, but the dispatch of business and the preservation of discipline.

I have had every opportunity of knowing them, and I can safely assert, that I have a thousand times found more arrogance and more pride under one demure face and plain coat, than under all the scarlet caps which afforded pretexts for the unbecoming sarcasm of the writer of the *First Impressions*. I am, sir, your ob't,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER TO CHANCELLOR DESAUSSURE

[The following letter addressed to Chancellor Desaussure, in order to correct a singular misapprehension of his respecting the Catholic tenets in regard to the retribution of sins in a future state, appeared in the *United States Catholic Miscellany*, No. 23 of Volume VII., for 1827.]

CHARLESTON, S. C., Dec. 5, 1827.

To the Hon. Chancellor Desaussure, and so forth.

My Dear Sir:—I address you with sentiments of great esteem for your person and office, but from a deep sense of duty. I trust, therefore, that the freedom of my language will not be considered as intending to wound feelings which I respect.

In a decree made by you in a case of partition, Elizabeth Fernandis and Sarah Hall *vs.* William Henderson, Union district, August, 1827, you have unintentionally done a serious injustice to the religion of the vast majority of the Christian world. No blame can be attached to you by them, for not having had it in your power to know their doctrines: nor was your intention to injure or to misrepresent them; on the contrary, you evidently sought to protect their civil rights, where you under a mistake believed them to be in jeopardy. Your act was therefore intended for their benefit; but, whilst I state this in justice to you, I must, in justice to myself and to my flock, endeavour to correct your mistake.

In this case, it was objected that a Mr. Charles Jones was an incompetent witness, because he stated that, from his private interpretation of the Scriptures, (the propriety of which mode, as the only rule of faith, is the great and I may almost say the sole cause of separation between the Roman Catholics and Protestants,) he did not believe in a future state of rewards and punishments, for the good and bad actions of mortals. Your statement is the following:

"Witnesses were called, who attested that these were the avowed principles and opinions of the witness objected to, as well at the time of signing the will, as at this time: but, being aware how easily the opinions of men may be misapprehended, or their principles misrepresented, I offered Mr. Jones permission to state his own creed on this point, if he should be disposed to do so. He expressed perfect willingness, and stated, (not on oath,) that he believed in the being and attributes of God; that he believed in the government of the world and of the affairs

of man, by the Supreme God; that he believed in Jesus Christ, and in the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament; that he believed God would punish the evil and reward the good actions of men; but that the whole of these rewards and punishments would take place in this world, and in this state of existence, until the justice of God be satisfied: and not at all in a future state of existence after the natural death of man; that evil commenced in this life will terminate in this life, and of course the punishment of it; that at the resurrection, man will be raised to immortality, and the immortal will not be punished for the deeds of the mortal. Mr. Jones stated that he believed that every man was bound to speak the truth on all occasions, and that any deviation from truth would be punished by the justice of God in this world; that he derives these opinions from the Scriptures alone, and that he held them at the time of signing the will, as well as at this time; but he does not know whether the maker of the will, who called on him to subscribe the same, was acquainted with his opinions."

In giving your decision favourable to the competency of this witness, the following passage is what particularly attracted my notice:

"What has made a great impression on my mind is, that the objection is of vast extent, the limits of which I cannot perceive. It might exclude all those from being witnesses, who do not believe in the eternity of punishments. It may exclude Roman Catholics, who believe the punishments in another world may be avoided altogether by absolution, or diminished by masses and prayers. In short, I know not where the objection would stop in its operation; and it would be more mischievous in this country than in any other, because the unbounded liberty of conscience enjoyed by our citizens, leads to many aberrations from the standard of belief which others think correct. The business of the court is not with opinions. The only question is, whether there is reasonable ground to believe that we have such a tie on the conscience of the person offered as witness, as may insure his telling the truth.. I think we have, in the case I am considering, and feel bound to admit the witness as competent."

Do you mean to say that a Roman Catholic believes that, by receiving absolution, whatever might be his dispositions, he will escape in the next world the punishment which God inflicts upon the unrepenting perjurer? Do you mean to say that a Roman Catholic believes masses or prayers will diminish the quantity of punishment due to the unrepenting perjurer from God's justice in the other world? If such be your meaning, you are very seriously mistaken as to our tenets. If such be not your meaning, your passage has, I believe, no bearing upon the case you were deciding.

I am not, I trust, captious in thus publicly addressing you, for the correction of this mistake: for I shall show you that we have already had our feelings sorely wounded, and our civil rights seriously jeopardized, by ignorance of our tenets in this very state. My friend, Judge Gaillard, told me that in York district, about two years since, an attempt was made in the criminal court to invalidate the testimony of the principal witness for the prosecution, upon the ground that he

was suspected of being a Roman Catholic; very fortunately, the honourable judge was too well acquainted with our tenets, to admit for a moment the extraordinary supposition, that, during eighteen centuries, the vast bulk of the Christian world was incompetent to testify in a court of justice. I put the supposition in this manner, as I feel that I could easily convince a mind like yours, trained and habituated as that mind has been to the nice discrimination of evidence, and the comprehensive view of a fine and important subject, that during those centuries the Roman Catholics did constitute that portion, as they now do constitute a body which is numerically more than four times as great as the aggregate of all the Protestants of the world: and comprising in that body its full share of the genius, the erudition, the talent, the wealth, the office, and the integrity of the civilized world. What, sir, must the learned men of our communion in other parts of the world think of the information of our state, when they find that such an attempt is made in our courts of justice? As an American citizen, I feel mortified; as a citizen of South Carolina, I deeply regret the obloquy to which our state would be exposed by the adoption of sectarian mistakes, for that knowledge which I once believed existed in every civilized country, but of which I now know several gentlemen, otherwise very learned, to be totally destitute.

When I address you, sir, I assure you I do not know to which denomination of Christians you belong; hence, when I select any denomination to exemplify my case, it is clear I mean not to depreciate that church. I will suppose that a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian commits perjury, and that what I have not always found to be the case with the members of those churches, this person believes in the eternity of punishment in hell; is there any room left for pardon from God, and for the escape of punishment? You will tell me, I presume, that pardon will be granted through the merits of Christ to the truly penitent, who will thus be brought to heaven. Can it be possible that you, sir, are under the impression that Roman Catholics believe they can obtain pardon by absolution without repentance? However reluctant I may be to believe this, I am driven to this conclusion by the following considerations. You do not deny the pardon of God to a Protestant penitent perjurer, and you consider that you have a bond upon his conscience by his belief that if he commits perjury, he will be condemned for ever in another world, unless he repents; you say that you have not so firm a bond upon the conscience of a Catholic, because he conceives that he might be pardoned by a different mode from repentance, viz.: by absolution. Unless this be your process of reasoning, it

is to me unintelligible; and I therefore conclude that you believe our doctrine to be, that absolution without repentance, would release from punishment. If you are under this impression, I beg leave respectfully to state, that you are very seriously in error. From you I have experienced kindness, and more than polite attention; you have betrayed your duty, if you, believing that I taught the abominable doctrine that my absolution could save an unrepenting perjurer, and with this impression on your mind, have treated me with kindness. If I taught such a doctrine, I ought not to be tolerated in any civilized state, and you, a venerable judge, ought to have been one of the first to denounce a monster who would preach so destructive a tenet. My dear sir, we believe that perjury is a mortal sin which deserves the eternal punishment of God's justice in hell; we believe that no sin is forgiven, except through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, upon the repentance of the sinner; thus, we stand, at least upon as firm a ground as any Protestant. If we require more than this, we demand more than the sects which you unintentionally favoured, insist upon; and if the bond be firm in the ratio of the requisites for pardon of perjury, and if we require more numerous and more severe conditions for pardon, the bond which we give is the best. We insist upon all that the Protestants demand, and thus our bond is equal to their best; further, we require confession to a clergyman, that he might judge, at the peril of his soul, instead of making the criminal his own judge; next, we require that restitution be made to compensate for any injustice which arose from the perjury; thus, in case Charles Jones, by perjury, caused William Henderson to obtain possession of what was really the property of Elizabeth Fernandis, and that Jones being a Catholic confessed this; the priest could not absolve Jones until he should have done all that lay in his power to have Fernandis put in possession of what she was entitled to receive; and should Henderson refuse to restore what he had through the perjury unjustly obtained, Jones would be obliged by the priest to compensate the injured Fernandis by a sacrifice of his own property, since the injustice was effected through him, and if the priest gave absolution without having insisted upon this restitution, such absolution would be invalid, and the priest would, by his neglect of duty, have now subjected himself to the obligation of paying to Fernandis what Henderson or Jones ought to have restored. Thus, sir, in the first place, we have your strongest bond of conscience, and we have the superadded bonds of the peculiar institutions which we have received from our blessed Saviour, and which your ancestors have cast away as being very troublesome and perplexing.

When we are conscious of being, if possible, more firmly bound by our oaths than any Protestants can be, what must be our feelings when we are exhibited in public courts as of questionable credit? When we know that our tenets are misrepresented by our enemies, and not thought worthy of examination by a few well-disposed and otherwise well-informed men, in that small portion of the civilized world, where our lot is cast; and when those good men publish the most extraordinary mistakes as legal dicta, and these dicta are published with a morbid avidity by our sectarian opponents, what will well-informed men in other countries think of the literary acquirements of ours?

The British government, in order to justify or to palliate its tyrannical persecution of Catholics, invented the vile calumny, that they were not to be trusted upon their oaths; and yet, as if to show the grossness of its criminality, it offered to the Catholic the test of an oath as the mode of his avoiding persecution; for if any man swore that he disbelieved certain tenets he was protected. Yet this test was administered to detect the Catholics, who, it was alleged, were not to be trusted upon their oaths, as they might perjure themselves by dispensation, or after perjury be absolved, and yet strange to say, the Catholics of whom this was said, would not swear, and were of course plundered and tortured because they would not swear! The pressure of circumstances in America, made it useful to conciliate the Irish Catholics, and this wise Protestant government offered a mitigation, provided they would swear that they were themselves credible upon oath; that is, swear that they would not perjure themselves—swear that they had not a dispensation for perjury. Do not startle, sir, at this absurdity? And yet, sir, this is the source of your legal mistake. I respect and esteem you, sir, but I regret that British folly and calumny should have left so much of its worst prejudice in South Carolina. I have reason to be grateful for the kindness of my fellow-citizens, and I am the more grateful, as they have been kind to me even when they were misled. If they treated me with courtesy whilst they were under the erroneous impression that I taught this demoralizing doctrine, what would they not have done had they known the truth?

The next position regards the diminution of punishment by masses and prayers. My dear sir, Roman Catholics believe perjury to be a mortal sin, they believe that whosoever dies in mortal sin is condemned to hell; they believe that persons condemned to hell receive no benefit from masses or prayers. Here, then, is another very serious mistake, which I should regret to see copied into an European paper, as made by a chancellor of South Carolina. Why, sir, the Spaniards, the Ital-

ians, and the Portuguese would ask in amazement, whether our judges knew anything of the history of the past ages, or of the state of the Christian world, or of the tenets of the Universal Church, were they to suspect that one holding so dignified a station, imagined their belief to be, that the soul of an unrepenting perjurer, could be aided in hell, by masses or by prayers. Could I address them, I would say, "My brethren, the judges of our state are very well-informed in the general principles of law; they are gentlemen of highly cultivated minds, of kind hearts, of liberal disposition, intimately acquainted with the laws of our country; knowing a great deal about the laws of England, and concerning the decisions of its courts, and most favourably disposed toward Roman Catholics; to me, several of them have been personally polite, but they know very little about our religion. I scarcely know one of them who has had any opportunity of knowing its first principles, and the notions which they have of its nature, are indeed curious, and were derived from our worst enemies, the English, whose yoke they have flung off, but many of whose prejudices against us they retain;—their knowledge of us being derived from British sources, then, you cannot expect that it should be accurate. Be not, then, astonished, if you find serious errors, when they mention us even in their solemn decisions, they do not mean to injure or to misrepresent us; but they act according to their knowledge; time will correct their mistakes." I should hope, sir, that in this address, it would be found that I had been more charitable than severe, and I would intreat of you to believe that upon practical Roman Catholics you have the most firm bond by an oath; for they believe that perjury is a mortal sin, deserving eternal punishment, from no part of which, absolution, prayers, masses, or penance, will deliver them, without true repentance through the merits of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

I remain, dear sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

PASTORAL LETTERS

FIRST PASTORAL LETTER OF BISHOP ENGLAND

Addressed to his flock in the states of North and South Carolina and Georgia, United States of America, on his taking possession of his see

John, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy See, Bishop of Charleston, to our beloved brethren of the Diocess of Charleston.

May the mercy of God the Father, through his blessed Son Jesus Christ, and the charity of the Holy Ghost, be always with you.

Beloved Brethren:—The change which has taken place, in the formation of your church, by its separation from the See of Baltimore, and its erection into a bishopric, requires that we who have been appointed to its government should express our sentiments upon the subject. [5]

Our forefather Adam in the day of his innocence, walked through Eden in favour with his Creator; the earth yielding spontaneously the means of his comfort here, and the heavens opening to his view scenes of future happiness. But by irregular curiosity, and presumptuous disobedience, he forfeited the felicity which he enjoyed, and lost all right to that bliss which he expected.

Upon his repentance, redemption was promised, but its application was to be made only upon condition which his ability could fulfil, but which his will might reject. Thus, although his salvation did not originate with man, yet without his co-operation it could not be accomplished; and that co-operation was the performance of the condition

[5] The Bull of His Holiness Pope Pius VII., dated July 12, 1820, separating the states of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia from the diocese of Baltimore, and for erecting for their government a new episcopal see, in the city of Charleston, (S. C.,) Suffragan to Baltimore, and appointing the Right Reverend Dr. John England, bishop thereof, was published in the Catholic Church of Charleston, on Sunday the 31st of December, 1820.

The certificate of consecration was also then read. It was signed by Rt. Rev. John Murphy, Bishop of Cork, who consecrated Bishop England on Sept. 21, 1820.

imposed by him, from whose wisdom, mercy, and beneficence alone, redemption was to be obtained.

The nature of those conditions was two-fold, belief and practical obedience; by them man was to pay the most perfect homage to the Deity; and whilst in their fulfilment, he was punished for his prevarication, by their consequences he was to be perfected in his scale of being. Belief humbled his understanding; obedience checked his will. His original fault was the pride of knowledge, its immediate consequence, obstinacy of disposition: by requiring the belief of truths beyond his comprehension, and the performance of acts not always agreeable to his disposition, as the conditions of his redemption, man was to be at once, punished for his crime, healed of his infirmity, and redeemed from his bondage. Hence, true religion consists in believing God when he teaches us, and obeying him when he commands us.

To discover what he teaches us, and to learn his commands, so that we may be faithful in both respects, is our duty; and this discovery is the result of the investigation of facts, and not of the examination of opinions. The Lord has frequently spoken by the mouths of his prophets, and finally by the mouth of his beloved Son, who came to fulfil the work of our redemption. When the Lord spoke, he made his revelations manifest to those with whom he conversed, and their authority plain to those whom he commissioned them to teach; and having thus exhibited his authorized teachers to his people, he required the obedience of that people. Thus when he sent Moses into Egypt, he strengthened him with the power of miracles, and when upon Sinai he gave a law, he thundered before the multitude, and called the teacher up to his presence: upon the authority of Moses, Aaron was consecrated, and the right of his family to the priestly office was confirmed, as well by the blooming of his rod, as by the catastrophe of Core and his adherents. The regular succession was all that was thenceforth necessary to learn, for the purpose of ascertaining in whom was vested the authority to teach, until he should come who was the desired of nations, this other Lawgiver whom the Father was to raise up to fulfil what was but darkly foreshown in the institutions of the desert. Hence when even they who held this authority persecuted the Redeemer, he stated the ground of his submission to them in the fact that they sat upon the chair of Moses. Their authority expired only with their law, and when that of Jesus Christ succeeded, we find another priesthood substituted for that of Aaron. The Lord hath sworn, and it will not repent him, said the royal prophet to the Messias, thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech. (*Psalm* cix. 5.) And upon

the night before he suffered we find him communicate this priesthood to his Apostles. Then he no longer called them servants, but friends. He made known to them the mysteries of the kingdom of God, that they should teach them to the nations of the earth; for he commissioned them to go forth to teach all nations, and promised that he and his Holy Spirit would abide with them all days, to the consummation of the world. As his heavenly Father sent him so he sent them, and whosoever should receive them should receive him, and, whosoever should reject them should reject him.

But as they, being only twelve mortals, could not go to all parts of the world, and were not to live all days to its consummation, it became necessary that they should associate others to them in their commission, as well to provide for the millions then living as for the generations that were to succeed them: and hence, we find that by prayer and the imposition of hands, they did qualify others, whom they associated to their apostleship, and sent forth to the work whereunto they had been selected by the Holy Ghost. And thus do we find in the new law the same principle which governed the old; the authority to teach, and to minister in the church specially bestowed upon particular individuals by God's appointment, and continued by regular succession to after ages; and hence no person can assume this authority to himself, but he who is called by God, as was Aaron. And hence the authority to preside and to teach in the church of God is not derived from talents, nor from wealth, nor from worldly power, nor from popular choice, nor even from the piety and virtue of the individual, but from his having been regularly assumed to the apostleship, and ordained therefor by some successor of an apostle who has thereby received his authority from Jesus Christ.

Amongst those Apostles there was one superior in dignity, preeminent in power— he whose name the Saviour himself changed to signify his office. "I say unto thee (Simon, son of Jona) thou art Peter; and upon this rock (Peter) I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And to thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven." (*Matt.* xvi. 18, 19.) And on another and a memorable occasion, when he addressed him in the language of warning and affectionate reproof, he established his duty of general superintendence. "Simon, Simon, behold Satan hath desired to have thee that he might sift thee as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not. And thou being once converted, confirm

thy brethren." (*Luke* xxii. 31, 32.) And again, when he gave him charge not only of his lambs, but also of the very sheep who were to give spiritual nutriment to those lambs.

Accordingly we find the Apostle St. Peter filling that place to which he had been appointed by the Saviour, when, after having been converted from his guilt of denial on the very night of the admonition, he on the day of Pentecost speaks in the name of the rest as their head and their chief; when he works the first miracle, and brings the first increase of Jews to the church: when, in his solicitude for the welfare of that church, he proposes to have an apostle appointed in the place of Judas who had fallen; when he, after the divine revelation, first receives the Gentiles into the fold; and in all things appears to be the rock upon which the spiritual edifice of Christianity was reared. The solicitude of the faithful, too, for him, as their head, is manifested by their continual prayer for his safety when he was kept bound by Herod.

As the Saviour established a church which was to last to the end of the world, its government was to be coeval with its existence; and hence Peter was to have a successor who was to possess his power, as Aaron had a successor who was invested with his high-priesthood. The chief Apostle first made the East the great theatre of his exertions, and the city of Antioch was his principal residence during about seven years; but his zeal, and the necessities of the church, and the providence of God, led him to Rome, then the capital of the world,—where, during twenty-five years, he exercised his supreme administration and authority, and crowned a life of exertion by a glorious martyrdom on the same day that the doctor of nations, St. Paul, who, during many years, had shared his labours, yielded his soul to his Creator. His successors, by occupying his place, have preserved his power,—and this is now vested in Pope Pious VIIth, the present Bishop of Rome.

Besides the divine authority to which slight allusion has been thus made, we have the testimonies of the most venerable authors of the earliest ages of the church to show the fact, that all Christians looked up to Rome as the mother and mistress of all other churches. In that See the Apostolic succession has been preserved; and to the bishop of that See it appertains to provide for the wants of the various parts of the world, which either have not become acquainted with the doctrines of the Redeemer, or, knowing his doctrines, stand in need of the administration of his sacraments.

Your former prelate, the Archbishop of Baltimore, finding that you were at too great a distance from him, applied to the sovereign Pontiff to relieve your wants, by giving you a bishop; and though our

deserts had not qualified us for the situation, yet our holy father has vouchsafed to regard us with a favourable eye,—and that the prayer of the archbishop might be granted, we have been selected, appointed, consecrated, and sent to govern your church. Thus we are placed in the midst of you, unworthy as we are, yet vested with apostolic power, having, through the Holy See, received that power from Jesus Christ himself.

We may then address you as our dearest children in Jesus Christ, for we are placed over you as a father to teach you the doctrines of truth, to guide you in the way of salvation, to feed you with the bread of life, and to spend ourselves for your eternal welfare,—as we must render an account for your souls, at his great tribunal, to that Father whose unworthy substitute we are, and who has shed his blood to purchase our souls from damnation. In proportion as the dignity of our order is great, so is our responsibility awful; and with you, beloved children, in a great measure it rests to lighten this burden. We shall endeavour, with God's holy assistance, to perform our duty with fidelity and zeal; we intreat your co-operation. We shall point out to you the path of your duty—we conjure you to walk therein; we will place the sacraments within your reach—we beg of you, through the tender mercy of Jesus Christ, to stretch forth your hands and partake of the celestial banquet; we shall incessantly offer up our humble supplications for you at the throne of grace; we particularly recommend to you assiduity in the discharge of the great duty of prayer, and trust that when your aspirations and petitions penetrate the clouds of heaven, the name of him who labours for your welfare may be found embalmed amidst the fragrance which will ascend to the seat of the Most High.

Let temperance, justice, mercy, benevolence, charity, piety, modesty, and chastity be your characteristic virtues; for you are called upon to serve a God of purity and perfection. Do not place confidence in your youth, your strength, your health, nor your riches—for you are the certain victims of death; you have been sentenced to return to the dust from which you have been originally taken, and you know not the day, nor the hour; wherefore we beseech you to be always prepared, for the Son of man will come at the moment when he is least expected.

Your past conduct, and what we have learned of your dispositions, leave no doubt upon our mind of your devotion to the interests of the state, and of your determination to fulfil your duty as citizens. You need not our exhortation on this head. But do not deem it presumption in us, who have not yet the honour of being an American citizen, to have adverted to the topic; for were it necessary, it would have been

our solemn duty to call upon you for the preservation of the public peace, and the maintenance of those liberal institutions by which you are so well protected; for we are the minister of the God of Peace, who has placed the sword in the hand of the governors for the good of society. And we ourself have for a long time admired the excellence of your Constitution, and been desirous to behold your eagle grow in strength and beauty as his years increased,—whether he rested in majesty upon the bases of the wisdom, the moderation, and the fortitude of your government, or, lifting himself on the pinions of your prosperity, and surrounded with the halo of your multiplying stars, fixed his steady eye upon that sun of rational freedom, which culminates for you, as it departs from the nations of the East.

We intreat of those within our jurisdiction who may be desirous of having spiritual assistance to make their wants known to us, that we may take the best steps which our limited means will allow for having them relieved; and as we cannot at present completely satisfy either their desires, or our own intentions on this head, we intreat their patience and indulgence until we shall be better able to fulfil the dearest wishes of our heart. But we must also remind them that they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel (II *Cor.* ix.), and they who serve the altar should live by the altar. And that it must depend in a great measure upon their own exertions, and the means placed at our disposal, whether we shall be able to have them served, and ourself gratified.

"As to the rest, brethren, be strengthened in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put ye on the armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the snares of the devil. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of justice, and your feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace: in all things taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye may be able to extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one; and take unto you the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God." (*Ephes.* vi.) Place your trust in the Lord Jesus, and in the abundance of his merits; stand perfect in every good work; walk as children of light; let your example so shine before men in all goodness, that they may glorify your Father who is in heaven; so that, after this transitory state of trial, the splendour of your virtues may reflect back the glory of redemption to the throne of your Saviour.

Peace be unto you, brethren, and charity with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

CHARLESTON, Jan. 21, 1821. JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LENTEN PASTORAL FOR 1821

John, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy See, Bishop of Charleston, to our beloved brethren of the diocess of Charleston.

May the mercy of God the Father, through His blessed Son Jesus Christ, and the charity of the Holy Ghost, be always with you.

Beloved Brethren:—The solemnity of Lent, and the approach of the holy time of Easter, demand that our pastoral solicitude should be evinced in your instruction. For behold now is the acceptable time, now is the day of salvation. And we helping are called upon to exhort you, that you receive not the grace of God in vain. But in all things exhibit yourselves, as the servants of the Lord, in much patience, in watchings, in fastings, in charity, in knowledge, in long suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned—walking in the footsteps of your predecessors in the faith, you meet with those sacred monuments of religion and antiquity, to which they have affixed the attestation of their approval, and added the decoration of their virtues. The waters of mortification, which appear bitter to those who have been filled with the flesh-pots of Egypt, were by them found pleasing and salutary, after they had been made sweet by the tree of the cross; fed with bread from heaven, they came to the holy mount of contemplation, where they received that sacred law, by the observance of which they obtained the promised blessings; and, notwithstanding the glow of temptation, they were enabled to persevere in this observance, by the sacraments which flowed from Christ, who was struck for our iniquities.

Professing the same faith, you are called upon to have recourse to similar means for attaining your sanctification. One of the most useful is the observance of the holy Lent, in which by bodily fasting, vices are repressed, the soul is elevated, virtue is attained, and rewards are received.

This is one of the most ancient observances of Christianity; we find it existing in every age and in every nation, where the Gospel of Christ has been preached. It is on record in the earliest writers, and amongst our most ancient and authentic documents—thus the sixty-eighth of the Apostolic Canons ordains, that a clergyman who will not fast the Lent, shall be deposed; and a layman who neglects it, shall be excommunicated; and specifies bodily infirmity as the only excuse. The observance of Lent is alluded to as a well-known practice in the fifth canon of the first Council of Nice. The regulations for the manner of

observing it, are made in the 49th, 50th, 51st, and 52d canons of the Council of Laodicea, as also in the 24th of the first Council of Orange, and in numbers of others, in those very early ages of the church. Many of the persons who, differing from our faith, were anxious to bring our practices into discredit, by endeavouring to show late periods for their introduction, have been obliged to acknowledge the antiquity of this custom, even in their attempt to overturn it, for they have assigned its introduction to Pope Telesphorus, who was the eighth in order from St. Peter, and who presided over the church from the year 140 to the year 152, whereas he only made a regulation as to the exact day when the clergy were to commence the observance of a fast, which had been established for upwards of a century preceding. St. Ignatius, the third Bishop of Antioch, and a fervent disciple of St. John, the Evangelist, who suffered martyrdom in the city of Rome, in the year 107, mentions this fast, in his Epistle to the Philippians. (*Apud Bellarm.*) It is alluded to by St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and fellow disciple of Ignatius, in his letter to the same people, and distinctly mentioned by St. Irenæus the Great, Bishop of Lyons, and disciple of St. Polycarp, who suffered martyrdom, in the year 202. In the year 199, we find the subject under consideration of all the churches, in Italy, Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece, and France, in several synods—not as a custom lately introduced, but derived from the Apostles. Without therefore exhibiting to you that cloud of testimony, which the Lord himself has given to direct us in our way through after ages, we may feel convinced that you clearly perceive the Apostolic origin of this sacred observance, and proceed to show you its advantages, and the obligations by which you are bound thereto.

Temperance in eating and drinking has at all times been regarded a great virtue; hence the Saviour charges his disciples: "Take heed to yourselves, lest perhaps your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness." (*Luke* xxi. 34.) And the Apostle says, weeping that there are many "whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, whose glory is their shame." (*Phil.* iii. 19.) Hence, too, those admonitions of the wise man, "Be not greedy in any banquet and do not fall on all the meats. Use as a frugal man those things that are set before thee, lest whilst thou eatest much thou shouldst be hated." (*Eccli.* xxxi. 19; xxxvii. 31, 32.) And "if thou sittest among many, be not the first to stretch out thy hand, nor ask to drink first." (*Eccli.* xxxi. 21.) This is a virtue necessary at every time, on all occasions, and whosoever, at any time, commits intemperance, violates his duty; he is guilty of an immoral act, and also injures his body; hence the ancient

Persians and Lacedemonians were particularly careful to train up their youth to the practice of this virtue, as the best safeguard of their mental energies, their bodily health, and their national institutions. Whilst temperance flourished in Greece and Rome, their liberties were protected, and it was only under the superincumbent bulk of luxury, gluttony, and intemperance, they were extinguished—for the natural consequence of this indulgence, is enervation of mind and sottish carelessness. "For in many meats there will be sickness, and greediness will turn to cholers. By surfeiting many have perished, but he that is temperate will prolong life." (*Eccli.* xxvii. 34.) We need not then be astonished at the apostrophe of an experienced physician, to temperance: "Thou source of human bliss, far exceeding our praise and admiration!—the glory and security of the first age of the world, which, for thy sake alone, was accounted golden!—the principal and last promoter of real comfort and composure, of serenity both of mind and body, thou crownest us with length of years, health, and pleasure, with a countenance cheerful and amiable, with limbs brisk and active, thy gifts extract applause from thy enemies, even from the most intemperate."

And of the soul, St. Gregory the Great says: "No one obtains the trophy of any spiritual victory, who has not first overcome the appetites of the flesh by the mortification of the belly; whilst this is not restrained, all virtues are destroyed, and overwhelmed together by the concupiscence of the flesh." (*Lib.* xxx., c. 26.) And St. Isidore says: "No one can attain the perfection of virtue, unless he has first overmastered the passion of gluttony." (Lib. de. sum bon. L. ii., c. 22.)

Temperance is a virtue which you are bound continually to practise, but, unfortunately, we all too frequently transgress on this head, so that we may well say, with St. Augustine, in his Book of Confessions: "In these temptations, I strive daily against the inordinate appetites of eating and drinking, and who is there, O Lord, who is not some little drawn beside the bounds of necessity? Whosoever he is, he is a great man; let him magnify thy name. I am not such a one, because I am a sinful man." (*Conf.* Lib. x., c. 31, n. 6.) And as vices are remedied by having recourse to the opposite practice, they who sin against temperance should have recourse to fasting. Hence, both in the old and new law, the practice has been strongly recommended, and we have the best examples of the observance in Moses, David, Daniel, Elias, our blessed Saviour, and his Apostles. We shall lay before you

a few particular examples to elucidate better the objects and benefits of the observance.

There are some propensities to sin extremely strong in us, since the fall of our first parents; one of the strongest and most dangerous, is that which is generally described as the sin of the flesh; not that external acts are necessary for criminality and condemnation, for the mind is criminal when it contemplates those acts: gluttony is its greatest excitement. "The people sat down to eat and drink, and then rose up to play," (*Exod.* xxxii. 6.) The best remedy is fasting; for the vice has been generally considered to be that devil which the Lord said could not be cast out, "but by prayer and fasting," (*Matt.* xvii. 20.) The great Apostle, St. Paul, informs us that there was given to him "a sting of his flesh, an angel of Satan to buffet him," (II *Cor.* xii.) And he also informs us, that he "chastised his body and brought it into subjection," (II *Cor.* xi.) And in another place he tells us one of the modes, "in many fastings," (II *Cor.* ix.) And again assures us that "they who are Christ's, have crucified their flesh with the vices and concupiscences," (*Gal.* v.) And such was always the doctrine of the fathers of the Church, who by their own conduct forcibly inculcated the necessity of the observance.

Prayer and contemplation of heavenly things, are indispensable duties of a Christian; and is it in the midst of feasting and revelry that those obligations can be fulfilled?—Did not even the pagan philosophers retire and abstain, to free the mind as much as possible from the distractions of the world, and the vapours of passion, that they might be able more clearly to discover truth!—And we have the example of Moses, who by a fast of forty days, prepared himself for intimate conversation with the God of Sinai.—Of Elias, who fasted forty days to behold God on Horeb. Of Daniel, who, "eat no desirable bread, and neither flesh nor wine entered into his mouth, neither was he anointed with ointment," (*Daniel* x.) that he might converse with the messenger of the Most High. And thus before her principal festivals, does the Church of God call upon her children, to imitate those venerable models, upon whom heaven has stamped its approbation; that they may be better prepared for the communications of the Holy Ghost, for as St. John Chrysostom says, "Fasting is the sustenance of the soul, for it spreads out light pinions, that upon them elevated on high, the mind may contemplate the most sublime things," (Hom. i. *In Genes.*)

Fasting performed with proper dispositions is an excellent mode of divine worship, for by it, through the merits of our Redeemer, we

are made more acceptable to God; thus we read of the devout Anna, that "she departed not from the temple, by fastings and prayers serving night and day," (*Luke* ii.) And St. Paul, speaking of the mode of worshipping God, informs us that we must, "present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and pleasing to God," (*Rom.* xii.,) which has been generally understood, of the sacrifice of our carnal or bodily appetites. Thus the first Council of Nice says, that "a clean and solemn fast might be offered to God." And Tertullian testifying the faith of his age, A. D. 230, states, that fasting upon "dry food taken at a late hour, is a grateful sacrifice to god," (Lib. *De Resur. Carn.*) Not that either the poverty of the food, or the smallness of the quantity, or the lateness of the hour, could of themselves be grateful, but the disposition of the soul, of which these were the consequences.

This holy observance, joined to the merits of the Redeemer, is also calculated to appease and satisfy God, when we have offended him; thus was he appeased by the Jewish people at Masphath, (I *Kings* vii.) Thus do we read, that when Achab heard the judgments of the Lord denounced, "he rent his garments, and put haircloth upon his flesh, and fasted, and slept in sackcloth, and walked with his head cast down; and the word of the Lord came to Elias the Thesbite, saying: Hast thou not seen Achab humbled before me? Therefore, because he hath humbled himself for my sake, I will not bring the evil in his days," (III *Kings* xxi.) By its means the Ninevites succeeded in appeasing the Most High; so also did the Jews in the days of Judith and of Esther. For this purpose Joel declares, "Now therefore, saith the Lord: Be converted to me with all your heart, in fasting and in mourning and in weeping . . . . . Who knoweth but he will return and forgive," (*Joel* ii.) "Thus," says Tertullian, "as the use of food first destroyed man, by fasting he may satisfy God." (Lib. *De Jejun.*) And St. Cyprian, Archbishop of Carthage, and cotemporary of Tertullian, "We appease his (God's) anger for our offences, as he himself informs us, by fastings and weeping, and lamentations," (Serm. *De Laps.*) St. Basil, in the next century says. "We fall into disease by sin, we are healed by penance, but penance without fasting is idle and fruitless; make satisfaction to God by fasting," (Orat. i. *De Jejun.*) To make further references would multiply authorities, but could not strengthen the evidence.

In fine, by fasting you may obtain from heaven, blessings both spiritual and temporal. You have already before you, abundant proof of the first part of the assertion, to which you may add, that solemn injunction of our blessed Lord, "But thou, when thou fastest, anoint

thy head and wash thy face, that thou appear not fasting to men, but to thy Father who seeth in secret, and thy Father who seeth in secret will reward thee," (*Matt.* vi.) Thus too we are informed that St. John the Evangelist frequently fasted to obtain spiritual blessings for a young man, to whom he was greatly attached. And we have the authorities of St. Jerom, and the venerable Bede, for the tradition, that he proclaimed a solemn fast previous to his writing his Gospel, to obtain the divine assistance in that work. St. Gregory Nazianzen, who flourished in the middle of the fourth age, tells us of a certain person who overcame grievous temptations by fasting and other mortifications, (Orat. *De Laud Cyprian.*) And St. John Chrysostom, shortly afterwards tells us: "Fast, because thou hast sinned: fast, that thou mayest not sin; fast, that thou mayest receive; fast, that the things which thou hast received may remain with thee," (Serm. i. *De Jejun.*) And for temporal benefits, we find many clear promises and facts. When Joel declares the will of the Lord, to "sanctify a fast," he shortly after adds the consequences. "The Lord answered, and said to his people: Behold I will send you corn, and wine, and oil, and you shall be filled with them, and I will no more make you a reproach among the nations," (*Joel* ii.) Thus do we read of the success in arms, of the patriotic Judas Macchabæus, who having rallied the scattered bands of Israel, for the defence of their country and their rights, assembled them at Maspha, "and they fasted that day, and put on hair-cloth, and put ashes on their heads, . . . and they joined in battle, and the Gentiles were routed, and fled into the plain, and they pursued them as far as Gezeron, and even to the plains of Idumea, and of Azotus and Jamnia," (I *Mac.* iv.)

Having laid before you the advantages of fasting, we now proceed, beloved brethren, to state to you, the objects of the church in the observance of Lent. "If we say, that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (*I John* i.) We must acknowledge, that "all we like sheep have gone astray, every one of us into his own way," (*Isa.* liii.) It is fit that we make public reparation for our offences: upon this ground, Pope St. Leo says, in his fourth Sermon on Lent: "Whilst our minds are distracted by the various concerns of this life, the hearts of even the religious must be soiled by worldly dust, it was therefore provided by the great and salutary wisdom of the divine institution, that a healing exercise of forty days should restore the purity of our minds, in which days pious works may redeem the faults of other times, and chaste fasts should perfectly remove them."

"Unless you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood,

you shall not have life in you." (*John* vi.) This is the solemn declaration of Jesus Christ: the time specially fixed, from the earliest ages, for discharging this important duty, is at Easter, to prepare better for which, the time of Lent has been fixed immediately preceding this great festival. This reason was stated upwards of fourteen hundred years ago, by St. John Chrysostom; and St. Jerom, in his commentary upon the book of Jonas, writes, "The Lord himself, the true Jonas, fasted forty days, leaving to us this inheritance of a fast to prepare us for eating his body, and by this number he prepares our souls." Now, too, the days are arrived when "the bridegroom is taken away from us," (*Matt.* ix.,) we should therefore fast. And for this purpose some particular time should be chosen, and what time could be more aptly fixed upon than these days, which, preceding the solemnity of Easter, bring to our recollection the indignities heaped upon our blessed Lord; who, for our sakes, "was made obedient even unto death," (*Philip.* ii.,) that he might "blot out the handwriting" (*Col.* ii.) of sin and death which stood against us. And thus, as St. Leo expresses himself, "we, about to celebrate that which is the greatest of all festivals, should prepare ourselves by such an observance, that by suffering we may be found dead, together with him in whose resurrection we are to arise."[6] Thus, too, do we pay as it were the tithe of our lives to him, as is observed by SS. Cassian, Isidore, and Gregory. Thus, too, do we endeavour, as far as our frail mortality will allow, to imitate our Divine model, who, being led by the Spirit, into the wilderness, fasted forty days and forty nights (*Matt.* iv.); upon this principle it was that St. Ignatius the Martyr, wrote to the Philippians "that the faithful were to fast in Lent, because it contains an imitation of our Saviour's conduct."[7] The time of Easter was also appointed in the early ages of the church for the conferring of solemn baptism upon the catechumens, and the faithful in their fasts were not only to seek for the graces necessary for themselves, but by the communion of Saints to have regard to the wants of others, particularly of the catechumens. Upon this subject St. Ambrose, the Bishop of Milan, in the end of the 4th century, writes: "Thus Elias by a fast continued during the space of forty days, allayed the long and excessive drought of the world by refreshing showers, and extinguished the thirst of the earth with abundance of rain from heaven; we know this to have been done in a figure of us, that we, fasting during those forty days, may deserve the spiritual rain of baptism, that the heavenly shower may

[6] Serm. xii., *De Quadrag.*
[7] *Apud Bellarm.*—de bon. oper. in part. L. ii., c. xvi.

be poured forth upon our too long parched land, and the salutary flood of this laver may flow upon the continued drought of paganism, for whosoever is not moistened by the grace of baptism suffers drought and burning of mind."

To dwell longer upon this subject is unnecessary; you must perceive that the Lent is a holy and salutary observance of a fast of forty days, preceding the festival of Easter, which has been instituted by the Apostles, adhered to by the Church of Christ in every age and in every nation, sanctioned by the greatest examples and the plainest evidences, its objects being most rational and salutary, and that by the command of the church every one of the faithful is bound to observe it, unless in case of utter inability or very great inconvenience, but of which inconvenience the individuals themselves are not allowed to be judges, for no one is allowed to be a judge in his own cause, but the inconvenience is to be stated to the chief pastor of the place, who is to pass judgment thereupon. It now remains that we lay before you the mode of this observance.

And here, beloved brethren, when we look back into the early records of the church, to discover in the conduct of our predecessors in the faith, the principles by which we should govern the flock committed to our care, we cannot but lament in spirit the contrast which exists between the dispositions of the faithful, in those apostolic days, and in our degenerate times. It is true, that we profess the same faith, we are united with them in the bonds of belief, we are members of the same Church of Jesus Christ. But, beloved brethren, and it is with pain and regret we say it, they esteemed better the maxims of the Gospel, and were more careful to use them for the regulation of their conduct. It was not by the example of those who separated from their body, but by the precepts and example of Christ and his Apostles they fashioned their lives.

Their observance of Lent was most strict; they, like the Prophet Daniel, during those forty days "eat no desirable bread, and neither flesh nor wine entered into their mouths." (*Daniel,* x.) Like John the Baptist in the desert, they had a most strict abstinence. (*Matt.* iii.) It is true they did not practise such extreme rigour in this respect, as that sanctified percursor of the Saviour, or as some of the immediate disciples of our Lord, for St. Gregory Nazianzen informs us that the prince of the Apostles seldom used any food but a small portion of the meanest quality.[8] Clement of Alexandria tells us that

[8] Serm. *De paup. Amor.*

the Apostle St. Matthew used a perpetual abstinence from flesh-meat.[9] And Eusebius testifies the same of St. James the Apostle, Bishop of Jerusalem.[10] Such, too, Philo the Jew describes to be the conduct of the first Christians in Egypt,[11] who were the disciples of St. Mark the Evangelist, and first Bishop of Alexandria. These fervent adorers never broke their fast before sunset, even with the sort of food which they took. "Adjudging the divine meditation of wisdom to be a work of light, and the curious feeding of the carcass, to be a work of darkness." The customs of abstaining from meat and fasting on one meal in the day, during the time of Lent, are testified to us, amongst many others, by St. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, by St Cyril, Archbishop of Jerusalem, and St. Basil, Archbishop of Cesarea, in the fourth century of the church; St. John Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and a multitude of others in the next age.

They considered themselves bound to this solemn observance, for though, as St. Augustine says,[12] "I, revolving this subject in my mind, in the examination of the gospels and of the apostolic letters, and in that entire instrument which is called the New Testament, find that fasting is commanded. But I do not in them discover it defined when we ought not to fast and on what days we ought to fast, by the command of our Lord or of his Apostles." The time was not originally pointed out by the Saviour, yet this time and the manner having been subsequently regulated by the first pastors of the church: hence the same father writes,[13] "At other times to fast may be a remedy for evil, or source of reward, but not to fast in Lent is a sin." And St. Ambrose says,[14] "Whatever Christian will not fulfil the Lent by fasting, must be considered guilty of prevarication and contumacy."

Thus, beloved brethren, you clearly perceive that you are bound, by the ecclesiastical law of the oldest date and of the highest authority, to fulfil this holy observance. You perceive the manner in which the first Christians passed this holy time was in abstaining from flesh-meat and luxuries, and fasting upon one meal in the day, which meal they did not generally take until after sunset, and then but sparingly. All those persons who have attained the full age of twenty-one years are bound to this observance, unless there should exist a sufficient cause

[9] Lib. ii., *Paedagog.* c. 1.
[10] Lib. ii., c. 23.
[11] *Apud Euseb.* Lib. ii. c. 17.
[12] Epist. 86.
[13] Serm. lxii. *De temp.*
[14] Serm. xxxiv.

for their exemption. Those causes which are considered sufficient shall be specially mentioned.

We now proceed to lay down the rules which you are to observe on the present occasion, and to the observance of which we strictly and solemnly exhort and command you in the name of the holy Roman Catholic Church, and by virtue of our authority derived from our Lord Jesus Christ, through the blessed Apostle St. Peter and his successor Pope Pius VII., stating therein the dispensations which we, by the same authority, give for the Lent of this year.

First, as to the fast on one meal in the day, during the entire Lent, Sundays excepted, we declare bound thereto, every person in our diocess, under our jurisdiction, who has attained the full age of twenty-one years, except those who may be actually sick, or recovering from severe illness—those whose extreme bodily weakness or delicacy renders this observance either impossible, or very dangerous to their constitutions—those whose daily occupations are very laborious or exhausting, and women in a state of pregnancy, or giving suck to infants. Any other persons, having what may be considered a reasonable cause for exemption, are required to state that cause to the clergyman under whose immediate care they are, and to take his decision upon it, by which they are to abide; and they who cannot have recourse to the clergyman, are warned to be cautious in making their own decision, lest blinded by inordinate self-love, they may deceive themselves.

On fasting days, the meal should not be taken before noon, and custom has long since tolerated the use of a slight collation besides this meal; which collation is generally taken at night, and should not exceed the fourth part of an ordinary meal.

In this country, we find that when the collation is taken at night, general usage has made it allowable to take in the morning a warm drink of tea, coffee, or thin chocolate made with water, to which a very small quantity of milk may be added, rather to serve as a colouring, than a nutriment.

At the collation, bread, cheese, all kinds of fruit, vegetables, and fish are allowed; but neither eggs, milk, nor butter.

Secondly, with regard to abstinences. To conform for the present to a custom which we hope shortly to see abolished, we dispense, in this law, from the first Sunday of Lent to Palm Sunday, both included, to the following extent, viz.:

So far as to allow the moderate use of flesh-meat, plainly dressed, on Sundays, at every meal; and on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, at dinner only.

But the persons who use this dispensation, are not allowed the use of fish at the same meal at which they use flesh-meat.

Custom and alleged necessity have also for the present introduced the use of hog's-lard, instead of butter, in preparing fish, vegetables, and so forth. This we tolerate.

Beloved brethren, you may consider these privations painful, but what are they in comparison of those endured by the first Christians, or of those at present endured by many of your brethren in countries where the apostolic discipline has been better preserved. Do then, we entreat you, exercise a holy severity upon yourselves, "for the kingdom of Heaven suffers violence, and the violent bear it away." (*Matt.* xi. 12.) Take therefore the yoke of the Lord upon you, and "do penance, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand. (*Matt.* iii. 2.) Enter seriously into yourselves, and be convinced that even your observance of this external discipline will avail nothing, unless it be performed with the proper dispositions. You have been hitherto perhaps negligent with regard to the great concern of your salvation. We beseech you to reflect upon that solemn question, "What doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" (*Matt.* xvi. 26.) "Be then converted to the Lord with all your heart, in fasting and in weeping, and in mourning, and rend your hearts and not your garments, and turn to the Lord your God, for he is gracious and merciful." (*Joel* ii. 12.) "Walk in the spirit, and you shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh, which are fornication, uncleanness, immodesty, luxury, enmities, contentions, emulations, wrath, quarrels, dissensions, sects, envy, murder, drunkenness, revellings, and such like, of which I foretell you that they who do such things shall not obtain the kingdom of God." (*Galat.* v.) To frequent gay parties in this holy season, is contrary to the penitential spirit of the times. "Be not conformed to this world, but be reformed in the newness of your mind, that you may prove what is good, and the acceptable and perfect will of God." "Loving one another with brotherly love: in solicitude not slothful: in spirit fervent: serving the Lord: rejoicing in hope; patient in tribulation: intent in prayer." (*Romans* xii.) For the fulfilment of which great duty, we particularly recommend daily attendance at the holy sacrifice of the mass, and at the public prayers and instructions of the church, to those who have the opportunity thereof, and to those who have not, that they assemble together daily, if possible, in prayer, and the reading of approved books; thus will they be united with their brethren of the Catholic Church, who now behold "between the porch and the altar, the priests, the Lord's ministers, weeping and saying,

Spare, O Lord! spare thy people, and give not thy inheritance to reproach." (*Joel* ii.)

Your fasting must be accompanied by works of mercy, otherwise you reap but little benefit therefrom. "Why have we fasted, and thou hast not regarded; have we humbled our souls, and thou hast not taken notice? Behold in the day of your fast, your own will is found, and you exact of all your debtors. Is this such a fast as I have chosen; for a man to afflict his soul for a day? Is this it, to wind his head about like a circle, and to spread sackcloth and ashes? Wilt thou call this a fast and a day acceptable to the Lord? Is not this rather the fast that I have chosen? Loose the bonds of wickedness, undo the bundles that oppress, let them that are broken go free, and break asunder every burden. Deal thy bread to the hungry, and bring the needy and the harbourless into thy house: when thou shalt see one naked, cover him, and despise not thy own flesh. Then shall thy light break forth as the morning, and thy health shall speedily arise, and thy justice shall go before thy face: and the glory of the Lord shall gather thee up. Then shalt thou call and the Lord shall hear: thou shalt cry, and he shall say, here I am." (*Isaiah* lviii.)

We again press upon your attention, and entreat you through the tender mercy of our Redeemer, to consider that a principal object of this holy institution is to prepare your souls for receiving the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. We therefore conjure you to prepare yourselves for the sacraments. It is with affliction we behold so many of you, particularly parents of families, who should be the models of good conduct for your children and servants, guilty of gross and flagrant delinquency in this respect, having the name of Catholics, but living like persons bereft of faith. "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, you shall not have life in you." (*John* vi. 54.) "Turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways, and why will you die, O house of Israel?" (*Ezekiel* xxxiii. 11.) Look to the decrees of the fourth Council of Lateran, on this head, which orders that those persons who shall have neglected complying with the great duty of confession and communion, at or about Easter, should be excommunicated and prevented from entering the church whilst living, and refused Christian burial when dead. Be consistent with yourselves: if you acknowledge the authority of the church, why not obey her commands? If you acknowledge the authority of the Redeemer, why not fulfil his injunction? Be aroused from your torpor, shake off your sloth: "The night is passed, and the day is at hand. Let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light. Let us walk honestly as in the

day; not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and impurities, not in contention and envy: but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ" (*Romans* xiii.); for he declares, "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him." (*John* vi. 57.) "And make not provision for the flesh in its concupiscences." (*Romans* xiii.) "But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither the rust nor the moth doth consume, and where thieves do not dig through and steal." (*Matt.* vi. 20.) "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them; for the things that are done by them in private it is shameful to mention. Rise, then, you that sleep, and Christ will enlighten you. Walk ye as children of the light, for the fruit of light is in all goodness and justice and truth" (*Ephesians* vi.); and being thus assimilated to Christ by virtue and sufferings in this life, you will subdue your passions, overcome your bad habits, be strengthened in grace, and enjoying that peace which the world cannot give, but which flows from a good conscience, you will sink calmly to repose in death, that you may spring reanimated to a glorious immortality; for "he that raised up Jesus Christ from the dead, shall quicken also your mortal bodies, because of his spirit dwelling in you. And if by the spirit you mortify the deeds of the flesh, you shall live: yet so, if we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him." (*Romans* viii.)

Peace be unto you, brethren, and charity with faith from God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, March 6, 1821.

LENTEN PASTORAL FOR 1836

To our beloved flock, the Roman Catholics of the Diocess of Charleston.

Health and blessing from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, in the unity of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Beloved Brethren:—In this holy time the church calls upon us with truly maternal solicitude to redeem the time we have misspent, and to exert ourselves in earnest for our salvation. Using the language of the Apostle, she warns us to lay aside the works of darkness and to be clothed in the armour of light, that we may be able to stand perfect in every good work.—In these days she has called us aside from the distractions of worldly pursuits and transitory pleasure, to reflect with calmness upon the prospect which lies open to our view. Our

path is to the gate of death, we are incessantly urged forward by time, already we have passed over a very large portion of the space allotted to us upon this earth! God alone can say how much remains!—we see the term of our course, but it is not given to us to measure its distance. She reminds us that beyond the precincts of death, the tribunal of our God is erected, and on either hand are found, a paradise of glory or a pit of perdition. In one or in the other is to be the lot of each individual, for eternity! She calls upon us, beloved, to examine dispassionately the important question, "In which of them is each one of us to dwell?" Compared with this inquiry, how vain, how trifling, how unimportant are those apparently grave questions which occupy the thoughts of the children of men? "What shall we eat! what shall we drink? with what shall we be clothed?" For after we shall have closed our mortal career, the bird of the air shall have his provision from our Father's hand, the flowers of the wilderness shall clothe the soil with the varied richness of their hue, and breathe their fragranee towards heaven. Then will other beings inhabit this earth, they will walk over our graves, they will forget that we existed; they will be occupied with such eares as press upon us, they will be filled with desires similar to those which we indulge, they will run after the toys by which we are allured:—and we—yes we shall have left our bodies to moulder through corruption, into dust; but our souls shall have been then consigned to everlasting happiness or to never-ending wo!—This is the great, the salutary truth upon which the church invites us to ponder—that considering those better things, we may be wise, and make provision for that eternity to which we hasten. This, beloved! is one of the great objeets of the time of Lent. So that in all our ways remembering our last end, we should never sin.

But, alas! we have sinned—we have received from our beneficent Father an abundant portion of his graces—with this we have thoughtlessly departed from his presence—we have squandered this treasure by our indulgence of passion, by our contempt for discipline, by our neglect of the sacraments, by our disregard of prayer, by our conforming to the spirit of the world—by our abandonment of those praetices of devotion in which we once found pleasure and strength, perhaps, we have plunged into the depths of vice, and now debased and indigent, we see those who once were much lower in the favour of our Father, now filled with the good things of his house whilst we are ready to perish. We are urged by the exhortations of the church, we are invited by the example of our brethren, we feel within us the inspiration of Heaven impelling us to make an effort—we are assured that our

good Parent desires our return, for he wills not the death of a sinner, but that he be converted and live. We are led to believe that he even looks towards that road by which he expects us, and waits, desirous of beholding us even at a distance, that he may stretch forth his arms to encourage us to exertion and perseverance. Let us then, dearly beloved, let us rise without delay and rush forward to a reconciliation! Too often have the inspirations of the Holy Ghost been rejected by us. Let us not add this time to our former prevarications. Let us in good earnest be wise unto justice; let us be zealous for our welfare, let us be obedient to our God—let us correspond with his graces, let us be active to salvation.

In order to insure this result, we must not place reliance upon ourselves, for our own strength is insufficient for this purpose; our help is from the Lord, who will give to those that place their trust in him, grace in seasonable aid; and if we correspond with the favour thus bestowed, we shall go on with increasing fervour in his service, the path of obedience to his precepts will be pleasant, and we shall find ample nutriment in the holy manna of his sacraments; by them he sustains us in our journey through this way of pilgrimage until our arrival at that true land of delights to which he has so pressingly invited us.

Of these sacraments that of penance is most necessary for us in these days of reconciliation. By its means we are made partakers of the merits of the Redeemer, for cleansing away of our iniquities, for removing the stains of sin, for overcoming our bad habits, for acquiring virtue, for securing the favour of our God.

If we say that we are without sin we deceive ourselves sadly; so far from being a proof of our innocence, the assertion is the evidence of our ignorance or of our neglect; it proves that either we do not sufficiently estimate the nature of that sanctity to which we are called, the perfection of that God in whose service we are engaged, the rigour of his judgment, the spirit of his Gospel or the obligations of our state; or that if we know them, we do not with sufficient care examine into our own conduct. His angels are not pure in his sight; how much less shall we who inhabit houses of clay? We, who, made less than those higher spirits, superadd the frailties of earth to the imperfections of the soul—we who, having fallen in Adam, have to contend not only against the weakness of our deteriorated nature, but against the bad example of the world, the allurements of vice, the suggestions of the wicked, and the spirits of darkness? Believe me, brethren, it generally is discovered that they who are most apt to flatter themselves into the

notion of being free from sin, are those in whom it has unresisted dominion. They who have been most eminent in the service of God, in the performance of the duties of religion, have uniformly been noted as the first to discover their faults, as they were the most ready to acknowledge and to correct them; whilst they who were puffed up by the pride of life, and filled with the spirit of the world, stood high in their own estimation. They had not been instructed by him who invited all to learn of him, because he was meek and humble of heart. They were therefore blind to their own vices and imperfections.

Being, therefore, sinners, we must have recourse to our Redeemer, for there is no other name given to men in which they can be saved, but the name of Jesus. He invites to him those who labour and are heavy laden, that they may find rest for their souls; the tribunal to which he invites us, is that which he established, when breathing upon his Apostles, he said to them, "Receive you the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall remit, they are remitted to them, whose sins you shall retain, they are retained to them." Thus did he establish the ministry of men as the channel by which his grace should be conveyed to their fellow-mortals and fellow-sinners. That this ministry should be exercised with discretion and judgment, a knowledge of the cause is required; and as this can only be obtained by the confession of the penitent, this ordinance was established not only under the Christian, but even under the Judaic dispensation; nor will confession avail anything without that true and sincere change of heart, by which, under the almighty influence, we are turned from iniquity, that it may not be our ruin; we bewail our past misdeeds in the bitterness of compunction, we resolve with God's holy assistance, not only to desist from sin, but to avoid its occasions, so that if our right eye should scandalize us, we would pluck it out and cast it from us; for it is better for us to enter heaven wanting an eye, or a hand, or a foot, than, having all our members, to be cast into hell fire. Under this influence we are brought to do judgment and justice that we may live;—we make restitution to those whom we have injured, we become reconciled to those with whom we were at variance, we love even our enemies, we do good to those who hate us, and we pray for those who persecute and calumniate us. Under this influence, we also feel as did those penitents who did eat ashes as bread and mingled their drink with their tears; we become thoughtful because of our transgressions; we cry out to the Lord whilst the thorn is in us, to wash us yet more from our iniquity, to cleanse us from our sin, to create a clean heart within us, and to renew a right spirit in our interior. We fill up in ourselves those things which are

wanting in the sufferings of Christ, we crucify our flesh with its vices and concupiscences, we labour to be assimilated to the Redeemer in suffering, that we may rise with him to the newness of a spiritual life, and feel the consolations of his peace within us.

God is faithful to his word, and if we thus confess to him, in his holy institutions, he will remove our iniquities. It is for this purpose that the church in her solicitude for our welfare, commands us to have recourse to him in this holy time; she desires that by means of his sacraments, these may become for us truly days of salvation. Alas! how frequently have several of you disregarded her voice and been led away from obedience to her precepts. In her name, I now invite you to return. Need I remind you of the penalty which she threatens to inflict upon those who disobey. The separation from the communion of her suffrages during life, and a refusal of the rites of sepulture after death. This is not an infliction of the vengeance which arises from hatred;—it is a wholesome severity to exhibit the importance of the duty to which she would urge; to rouse the negligent, to urge the slothful to exertion. It is the evidence of her affectionate solicitude for your welfare; it is an effort of her love.

Under the same penalty she urges you to the holy communion of the body of our Lord. She but reduces to special and distinct practice the great principle which the Saviour himself laid down. Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you cannot have life in you, is the assertion of our blessed Lord Jesus Christ. And, surely, my beloved brethren, we cannot procure eternal life by any other mode but that pointed out by the Son of God! No Christian would hazard the assertion that he could obtain heaven whilst he omitted to do that without whose performance the Saviour distinctly asserted it should not be obtained. His word is not to be contradicted, because we do not choose to perform our duty. As well may it be said that we can have assurance of life eternal whilst we continue to commit those deeds which bring death to the soul. God is not mocked—he is not like man that he should deceive us—whatever he declares, will most assuredly take place;—the heavens and the earth may pass away, but his word will not fail. He requires for the possession of spiritual life on this earth, the participation in the holy Eucharist; and in order to have this requisition duly attended to by her children, the church under the penalty of her censures, directs compliance therewith, at Easter or thereabouts. In the early days of the fervour of Christian zeal, the faithful generally received the holy communion on every Sunday. They were permitted in the time of persecution, on voyages, on

long journeys and other occasions, to carry the holy sacrament with them, so that though they should not have the happiness of being present at the holy sacrifice of the Mass, they might at least not be deprived of the holy communion. These were, indeed, days of fervour! Then did the spirit of religion predominate over that of the world in the devoted band of the brethren in faith. In process of time their charity became cold, they loved the world and things of the world, and it became necessary to command them to approach to that holy banquet to which their predecessors used to press forward with such holy eagerness, with such enthusiastic affection. It was then enacted that whosoever did not receive the holy communion at least thrice in the year, viz.: at Christmas, at Easter, and at Pentecost, should be separated from the body of the faithful. Thus did the law of discipline continue from the fourth to the thirteenth century in the greater part of Christendom; but in the year 1215, a further relaxation was made, and the third Council of Lateran enacted that the obligation of confession and communion should not bind under this penalty except for once in the year, viz.: at Easter, and by this law, the bishop is empowered to execute this decree against those who remain criminally negligent.

Alas! beloved brethren, when we look around us, when we consider the prevalence and the extent of this neglect, how are our hearts filled with sorrow? We do not threaten, but we entreat, we supplicate you;—we ask you, as the prophet of the Lord once asked the people, "Why will you die; O house of Israel?" We beseech you by the tender mercy of Jesus Christ, no longer to defer the performance of this duty! You have procrastinated too long. Do not delay any longer your conversion to the Lord; but if through our humble and imperfect ministry, you hear the voice of your God calling you to his favour—to a reconciliation which should be the object of your most earnest desires, do not procrastinate. Accept his invitation, be a guest at his banquet. This day is yours, you cannot answer for another. May he urge you forward by his holy inspirations! May he fill your hearts with his love, with sorrow for your offences, with zeal for your improvement, with the determination to persevere in his service! May he fill you with his peace upon the earth and crown you with his consolations in heaven.

In order that we may all exert ourselves to obtain so desirable a result, I invite you to unite for a few days in spiritual exercises, of meditation, of instruction, and of prayer, to add, according to your means, alms-deeds to your fastings, and thus prepare your souls for

worthily receiving those holy sacraments, for which you are bound to apply in this holy season.

In order to aid for this great and salutary purpose, there will be in the city of Charleston on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday after the fourth Sunday of Lent, on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday after Passion Sunday, and on Monday and Tuesday after Palm Sunday, the following exercises at the cathedral:—

In the morning, at half-past six o'clock, a short prayer and meditation; at seven o'clock, mass; after which, a portion of the holy Scriptures of the New Testament will be read. On Friday, at ten o'clock, mass; after which the stations of the holy way of the cross will be gone through.

In the afternoon, at six o'clock, five decades of the Rosary of the B. V. M.; after which, a portion of some spiritual book of instruction will be read. Select prayers will be recited before and after a discourse, which will be delivered at seven o'clock.

And for the purpose of encouraging the attendance of the faithful at these holy exercises, by special power for that purpose granted to me by the Holy See, I do hereby publish and grant a plenary indulgence to all those who with becoming dispositions will attend four times at the exercises at half-past six o'clock in the morning, and as often at the exercises of the afternoon, and shall worthily partake of the sacraments of penance and the holy Eucharist, and on the day of communion offer up, either in the church, or in the private chapel, the usual prayers for the prosperity of the church, the conversion of sinners, and the peace of our country, and of all other Christian lands, and bestow such alms as they may find convenient upon such object of charity as they may prefer.

For those churches and stations outside the city of Charleston, and within the diocess, the several pastors or missionaries will according to their means and opportunities regulate such spiritual exercises as they shall find practicable, and as nearly as may be, conformable to the above, and by the observance of the same, and receiving the sacraments of penance and the holy Eucharist, offering the prayers and disposing of the alms on the day of their communion, the same indulgence may be obtained by the faithful, at such time as may be regulated between this period and the octave day of the festival of Corpus Christi inclusive, which will be the 9th day of next June.

May the God of all consolation preserve you in his service, and

bestow upon you that peace which the world cannot give, is the sincere prayer, beloved brethren of

Yours affectionately, in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, March 9th, 1836.

LENTEN PASTORAL FOR 1837

John England, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved brethren and children in Jesus Christ, the clergy and laity of the Roman Catholic Church of the Diocess of Charleston, health and blessing. Grace be to you, and peace from God the Father, and from our Lord Jesus Christ, and from the Holy Ghost.

Beloved Brethren:—The great object of life is to secure happiness, and the admonition of wisdom is, by timely exertion, to attain the most perfect enjoyment for the longest duration. Knowing your belief in the immortality of the soul, and in a future state of rewards and punishments, as also that God is not mocked; and that what things a man shall sow those also shall he reap (*Gal.* vi. 8), we would exhort you in this holy time that you receive not the grace of God in vain, but that you work out your salvation in fear and trembling. (*Phil.* ii. 12.) Confining their views to this transitory state, the children of the world seek for happiness in what they may eat, what they may drink, and the raiment with which they may be clothed; they lay up for themselves treasures upon earth, where the rust and the moth consume, and where thieves dig through and steal. (*Matt.* vi.) But from you, brethren, we look for better things. Instructed in the doctrines of Christ, by which you are made wise unto salvation, you are aware that the figure of this present world passes quickly away (I *Cor.* vii. 31); and in using the things of this world, you should be so detached from them in spirit as to leave them without reluctance, and to be always ready to relinquish them rather than expose yourselves to the danger of offending God, or of injuring your immortal souls; "for what doth it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" (*Matt.* xvi. 26.) "Be you not solicitous, therefore, saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewith shall we be clothed? For after all these things do the heathens seek. For your Father knoweth that you have need of all these things. Seek ye, therefore, first the king-

dom of God and his justice, and all these things shall be added to you." (*Matt.* vi. 31, 32, 33.) Yes! beloved brethren, the pretexts of prudence, under which the spirit of covetousness, the spirit of mammon, the spirit of this world endeavour to conceal themselves, bear to the eye of the worldling a plausible appearance; but indeed they are void of solid reason. It is too frequently urged that the practice of the duties of religion stands in the way of our worldly prospects, and that if we would be industrious and attentive to the interests of those to whom we are under indispensable obligations, we must forego many of those religious observances, that, however commendable they might be in themselves, yet would prove obstacles to our worldly prosperity. Alas! my brethren, "you have not so learned Christ; if yet you have heard him, and have been taught in him as the truth is in Jesus,—to put off, according to the former conversation, the old man, who is corrupted according to the desires of error, . . . and put on the new man, who, according to God, is created in justice and holiness of truth." (*Eph.* iv. 20, 21, 22, 24.) He indeed hath taught us not to make provision for the flesh in its concupiscences (*Rom.* xiii. 14); to avoid being troubled about many things, but to seek that one thing which is necessary, and which he calls the best part (*Luke* x. 41, 42); to take heed and beware of covetousness, for a man's life doth not consist in the abundance of things which he possesseth (*Luke* xii. 15); exhibiting to us a most instructive parable to sustain and to enforce his exhortation. Yet he does not teach us to neglect our lawful avocations for the purpose of an exclusive devotion to religious exercises. He requires a preference for that which is better, the eternal inheritance; seek first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and he promises his special providence to aid in the supply of our necessities by his blessing upon our honest and well-regulated industrious pursuits; and all these things shall be added to you. Does not our own experience accord with the testimony of the inspired writer. "I have been young, and am now old; and I have not seen the just forsaken, nor his seed begging bread." (*Psalm* xxxvi. 25.) The practice of the duties of religion induces those habits of prudence, of industry, and of frugality, which are conducive to temporal prosperity,—whilst the irreligious are inclined to dissipation, both of means and of time, in seeking to gratify those passions which they have neglected to restrain; and the indulgence of which, whilst it forms the obstacle to the practice of piety, is also the most profuse absorbent of the pelf which has been too often acquired by injustice. Is there amongst us one of any experience and observation who could not testify with the same writer, "I

have seen the wicked and mighty exalted, and lifted up like the cedars of Libanus; and I passed by, and lo! he was not; and I sought him, and his place was not found." (*Psalm* xxxvi. 35, 36.) But even if such were not the case, we might truly say, "Better is a little to the just, than great riches to the wicked; for the arms of the wicked shall be broken in pieces; but the Lord strengtheneth the just." (*Psalm* xxxvi. 16, 17.) "The sinner shall borrow, and not pay again; but the just showeth mercy, and shall give." (*Psalm* xxxvi. 21.)

These remarks have suggested themselves, because of that unfortunate disposition which so extensively exists amongst those who are considered prudent in the ways of the world, to plead that their obligations to their family, or the necessity of laying up provision for other times, interferes with their desire of being religious, and baffles their determination of performing their solemn Christian duties. To such persons we are bound to say with the candour which is demanded by our ministry, that if they are engaged in any unlawful traffic, if they seek to hoard up wealth by those modes which are condemned by the Gospel, if they be such as the apostle describes, "They who would become rich fall into temptation, and into the snare of the devil, and into many hurtful and unprofitable desires, which drown men in destruction and perdition; for covetousness is the root of all evils; which some desiring have erred from the faith, and have entangled themselves with many sorrows." (I *Tim.* vi. 9, 10.) "If they oppress the poor, if they do violence to the humble, if widows are their prey, if they rob the fatherless, what will they do in the day of the visitation and of the calamity which cometh from afar? To whom will they flee for help, and where will they leave their glory?" (*Isaias* x. 2, 3.) To these unfortunate persons would we proclaim that "a deceitful balance is an abomination before the Lord: and a just weight his will. Where pride is, there also shall be reproach: but where humility is, there also is wisdom. The simplicity of the just shall guide them: and the deceitfulness of the wicked shall destroy them. Riches shall not profit in the day of revenge: but justice shall deliver from death. The justice of the upright shall make his way prosperous: and the wicked man shall fall by his own wickedness. The justice of the righteous shall deliver them, and the unjust shall be caught in their own snares. When the wicked man is dead there shall be no hope any more: and the expectations of the solicitous shall perish." (*Prov.* xi. 1—7.) These persons indeed cannot be expected to the performance of the great duties of religion; the manna of the sacraments, which is most delicious food to the true child of Israel, is not only very light but unsavoury to the

unfortunate being whose delight is in the flesh-pots of Egypt, though his body is in the camp of the Lord of hosts, and his resting-place in the very vicinage of the tabernacle. To partake of the sacraments would be for them to take in the food of death, and their homage would be a mockery and an abomination. But how dreadful is their state! Remaining as they are, their consciences if not seared, are to them exceedingly afflictive. To escape the tortures of remorse, they avoid the admonitions of religion; yet this neglect itself being an evidence of criminality that seeks its destruction: thus they labour to undermine the convictions of their understanding; and as the apostle says, they fall off from the faith. They are not only thus criminal in their own regard, but cruel to their offspring upon whom, together with whatever they can save of their ill-gotten wealth, they entail their infidelity. The continuance of their worldly prosperity will insure their importance. It is of such persons the Saviour says, that "it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for one of them to enter the kingdom of Heaven." (*Matt.* xix. 24.) They cannot serve God and mammon. They hear these things, and they deride those who proclaim them. They are indeed clothed in purple and fine linen, and feast sumptuously every day: they die, and they are buried in hell: they heed not the evidences of revelation, neither would they do penance if one came to them from the dead. (*Luke* xvi.) Alas! my brethren, in contemplating this widespread and desolating infatuation, we can only weep and pray that God would shorten these days, so that some flesh might be saved. (*Mark* xiii. 20.) Should these men return to their duty, should they, as in the days of their youth and innocence, seek for the calm and sweet consolations of pure and undefiled religion, what extensive restitution should be made? What blasphemies are to be retracted? What seductive and criminal ties are to be broken away? What tears are to be mingled with the blood of that lamb by whose wounds they are to be healed, and their baptismal robes cleansed from multiplied impurities? How truly has the apostle described covetousness as the root of all evils? Of such as these, we say, in the affliction of our heart, that even in these days of salvation, our hope is small. They are not beyond the reach of him who from the stones can raise up children to Abraham! May he look upon them in his mercy!

But, beloved brethren, there is another class of negligent persons to whom we would address ourselves with better hope. They also, it is true, use the same language as those whom we have described: they plead that their worldly occupations will not afford them the necessary leisure for the discharge of religious duties: yet they feel serious re-

morse because of their long neglect. They are not engaged in dishonest pursuits, they do not seek to circumvent, nor to deceive in their transactions with other men; they are just and honourable in their dealings; and upon the maxim of the Saviour, they do unto others as they would that all men should do unto themselves; still, however, they do not give to God that homage which is due to him. They plead the want of leisure, when they should rather avow that it was the want of inclination. They have time to labour for the meat which perisheth, but will not find time to secure that which endureth unto life everlasting. Alas! my brethren, these men are called wise; they are esteemed virtuous; they contrive to find leisure for relaxations and the amusements as well as for the business of life; and yet they can find no moment which they would devote to the sanctification of their souls, to their reconciliation with an offended God, to the acquiring of that peace which the world cannot bestow, to establishing their claim to a heavenly inheritance through the merits of their Saviour! They have no leisure. What then is the manner in which the Lord's day is occupied? Does the spirit of the world lead them to forget that this day is to be principally devoted to the duties of religion? Does their covetousness urge them to infringe upon the sacred ordinance, and to take from God and their own souls, that time which it would be not only injustice but sacrilege to devote to the business of the world? We trust that such is not the case. They are then deprived of this semblance of an excuse; they have abundant time if they had sufficient inclination.

Trusting, therefore, that you are so disposed, and that you will turn that time to beneficial account for your souls, we shall, beloved brethren, lay before you a brief admonition as to the mode in which, at this holy season, you might be most profitably employed in the concerns of your salvation.

You are aware that, in this holy time of penance, the great object of the church is, by bodily fasting, to elevate your minds to heaven, to bring you to a spirit of compunction for your sins, to lead you to mortify your passions, to repress vice, to avoid sin, to practice virtue, and through your Lord Jesus Christ to merit the rewards which he has promised to those who dying with him to the world will be raised by him to a new life of grace. It is for this purpose that she multiplies her offices, invites you to prayer, extends the means of instruction, and exhorts, reproves, intreats, rebukes, and is urgent with you. But she specially in this time, lays her commands upon you by that authority derived from the commission of Jesus Christ, (*Matt.* xvi. 19; *John* xx. 21, and so forth), to receive the holy sacraments of penance and euchar-

ist. There was a period, brethren, when her children did not require a command from her to be added to the invitation of the Saviour. It was enough that they felt themselves oppressed by the weight of their own infirmities, and heard the endearing words, "Come to me, all you who labour and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you." (*Matt.* xvi. 20.) They went with eagerness to learn humility and meekness; to take up the yoke of the Lord and to find rest to their souls. In the spirit of that humility, they might have hesitated to approach to eat the flesh of the Son of God; did they not hear his own admonition, "Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you" (*John* vi. 54); knowing that whosoever partook thereof unworthily, was guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (I *Cor.* xi. 27), they proved and tried themselves, and had recourse to that tribunal which the Saviour established for the remission of sins to those who truly repented. (*John* xx. 22, 23.) Thus, when the children of Jesus Christ were gathered around the table of his spouse, like olive-plants around the fruitful vine (*Psalms* cxxvii. 3), they drew plentifully of the invigorating nurture that not only multiplied their number but accelerated their growth, and made them produce not alone the tender foliage which gratified the eye, but also the luxuriant fruit which the first ages of Christianity saw gathered for heaven. These, indeed, brethren, were days in which the sword of the persecutor was unsheathed, and a destructive beast ravaged the vineyard; but patient zeal overcame fury, and a virtuous progeny survived the destroyer. Though for a time desolation appeared upon the earth, yet was it but the means of adding to the spirits of the just made perfect for their celestial abode. At such a time as this, the business of the Christian people was, by their exertions for a time, to secure their salvation for eternity. And are we not called in the same vocation, though not liable to similar sufferings?

During the ages of this conflict, it was not necessary to enforce by any ecclesiastical precept the frequenting of the holy sacraments; but the charity of man grew cold after the rage of persecution had subsided; and the fifth century of Christianity exhibits the command to approach at least on the occasion of the three great festivals of Easter, of Pentecost, and of Christmas. When the devastations of barbarism had added to evils which heresy had inflicted upon the church, and the license of the soldier combined with the ambition or the rapacity of his chieftain to disregard the evangelical counsels and to break through moral restraints, the neglect of the sacraments became an alarming symptom of the decay of religion; in the thirteenth century, the fourth

Council of Lateran deemed it useless to endeavour to bring the great bulk of the people to approach to communion at the three great festivals, and was in the affliction of spirit reduced to the necessity of so modelling the law, as to make it obligatory only once in the year, that is at or about the festival of Easter. Thus it was enacted, that if any one of either sex who had come to the proper years of discretion should, having the opportunity, neglect at this period[15] to confess his sins with the dispositions of true repentance, and go to the holy communion, he should be liable to excommunication. And such is the present state of the law upon this subject. And when we look around us, and contemplate the gross neglect of this salutary enactment within our own charge, we are covered with confusion and filled with self-reproach; for although we have rebuked and intreated, instructed and besought, as you are well aware, and must bear us witness before the throne of our judge; yet we do fear, that although we have done much, yet that we have been deficient in some way. Bear with us then, brethren, for our soul is at stake, whilst we again and again, through the tender mercies of the Saviour, exhort and intreat you not to suffer this holy season to pass away, as so many others have done, as a testimony of your unfaithfulness when it should have brought the exhibition of your fidelity in the exercise of piety. Redeem the time that you have misspent, and now at least, bring forth worthy fruits of penance.

As our confidence is that you may, by God's grace be excited to approach to the tribunal of penance: we shall endeavour, beloved, to bring to your recollection those things in which you have already been instructed regarding the sacrament that is there administered.

The sacrament of penance consists of three parts, viz., contrition, confession, and satisfaction, on the part of the penitent; and absolution, on the part of the minister, who must be at least a priest having canonical jurisdiction. His being merely in priest's orders does not suffice. This sacrament is as necessary for those who have had the misfortune to lose their baptismal innocence, as baptism is for those who have not yet been born again of water and of the Holy Ghost. It is indeed as St. Jerome says, the plank upon which alone, after the shipwreck of that innocence, we can hope to cling for safety in the perilous ocean of life. It has also been styled a laborious baptism,

[15] There is no ecclesiastical law binding to Paschal confession. The point of obligation is simply confession once a year; the exact time when to confess is not specified. But communion must be received during the so-called Paschal time, that is, "at or about the festival of Easter." This law is founded upon the constant practice of the Church, on innumerable decrees or canons of church councils, and has been re-affirmed by the Council of Trent.—Ed.

for that merciful God whose grace we have abused by our prevarication after baptism, does not admit us to this second reconciliation with the same facility that he did to the first.

Contrition is a hearty sorrow for having offended God, who is so amiable and worthy of our affection. It necessarily includes a detestation of sin, a serious determination to avoid it, and an intention of making such reparation as may be in our power to God and to our neighbours, for offences or injuries committed against either of them.

Sorrow arises from various motives. The sinner might repent of iniquity because of the punishment which it induces, and whilst he laments his being liable thereto, he regrets that this obstacle should exist to the indulgence of his passions, and though he avoids external misconduct, his heart is unchanged; his attachment to sin continues. He is not contrite; yet the dread of punishment operates usefully in his regard, as it arrests the progress of crime to its completion, and leads the sinner to reflect upon the judgments of him who, after having slain the body, has power to cast both soul and body into hell-fire. This fear is inculcated as wholesome by the Saviour (*Luke* xii. 5, and xiii. 3, 5), and its utility is testified by the Apostle St. Paul (*Rom.* ii.). Others repent from a better motive, urged by gratitude to God for the benefits which they have received at his hands, they lament their offences, and are drawn to serve him with affection; love of their benefactor is their motive, and reviewing his own excellence, they discover how amiable he is, and how deserving of their affection; loving the Lord, they detest from their hearts those crimes by which he is offended; they bewail their iniquities, and they sincerely desire to enter into the service of their Redeemer.—It is to the sorrow founded upon those motives that you should aspire, for this is the beginning of contrition. It is made perfect when the heart raises its affection above mere gratitude, and loves God for his own sake, contemplating the excellence of his nature, the height of his perfections, and the amiability of his qualities: considering herself created to admire and to love this supreme good, the soul bewails in the bitterness of affliction, the offences of which miserable creatures whom he formed for his service are guilty. This is indeed loving the Lord God with our whole heart, and with our whole soul, and with our whole mind. (*Matt.* xxii. 37.)

This disposition of heart must be obtained from God, for it is his gift, as the Saviour declares that without him we can do nothing which would bring us to eternal life (*John* vi. 44, and xv. 4), but he will not refuse those who ask of him in the sincerity of their hearts and the fervour of spirit. (*Matt.* vii. 7; *John* xiv. 13, 14.) Do you then ad-

dress him in the words of the prophet praying on the behalf of Israel, "Convert us, O Lord to thee, and we shall be converted: renew our days as from the beginning." (*Lament.* of Jer. v. 21.) Excite your faith to the belief of his doctrines, because "without faith it is impossible to please God; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is a rewarder of them that seek him." (*Heb.* xi. 6.) Thus will you make due preparation for bringing the kingdom of heaven within your souls, and when you shall have been turned from iniquity led by such motives, iniquity will not be your ruin, for the Lord has declared, "If the wicked do penance for all his sins which he hath committed, and keep all my commandments, and do judgment and justice, living he shall live, and shall not die. I will not remember all his iniquities that he hath done: in his justice which he hath wrought he shall live." (*Ezech.* xviii. 21, 22.) And further, the Lord himself in the same place shows his desire to aid you, if you correspond with that first grace which he so frequently bestows to excite you to come to him. "Is it my will that a sinner should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should be converted from his evil ways and live?" Thus to the truly contrite sinner, a merciful God vouchsafes through the merits of Christ, to promise the eternal life of his heavenly kingdom: for though the promises have been made by the prophets before the incarnation, and even at an earlier period by the patriarchs, by divine authority, still we know that there was no mercy or forgiveness except by virtue of the Redeemer; "for there is no other name under heaven given unto them, whereby they must be saved." (*Acts* iv. 12.) All those promises had relation to the atonement which he was to make, who, when we were sinners died for us, that being justified in his blood we might be saved from wrath through him. (*Rom.* v. 8, 9.) "If any man sin, then, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for those of the whole world." (I *John* ii. 2.) "Having therefore a confidence, brethren, in the entering into the sanctuary by the blood of Christ, a new and living way which he hath dedicated for us through the veil, that is to say his flesh, and a high priest over the house of God: let us draw near with a true heart in fulness of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience . . . let us hold fast the confession of our hope without wavering (for he is faithful who hath promised). And let us consider one another to provoke unto charity and to good works; not forsaking our assembly, as some are accustomed, but comforting one another."

Brethren, when the sinner's heart becomes hardened by pride, he

is elevated in his own esteem, and glories in his power—he must have his heart ground down, as it were, pulverized; and hence the ancient and expressive word *contrition*, which means, rubbing down into fine powder this obduracy. This is effected by reflection upon the enormity of sin, upon the dangers to which we are exposed by its means, upon the loss of heaven which is its consequence, upon eternal death which is its wages, upon the ingratitude which it exhibits. By such reflections we may greatly aid ourselves to enter into a proper frame of mind to bewail our iniquities, and feel that whilst we have served the swine of our passions, and been unable to satisfy ourselves with the husks in which they delight, vast numbers who have heretofore been strangers are filled with the good things of our father's house. Should we not be humbled and heartbroken at this melancholy state of our souls,—should we not lift up our eyes, though at a distance, and seek to return to that Father from whom we have strayed, whose grace we have so thoughtlessly squandered? Returning with humility, let us strike our breasts and call for mercy, whilst we acknowledge that we have sinned, and are no longer worthy to be called thy children. If we be contrite, we will be humble and desirous, nay, anxious to do all that God requires of us,—we will eagerly seek the tribunal of penance, we will anxiously seek how we may be able to make satisfaction; and we shall trample under foot the false shame by which we have too long been influenced.

Beloved brethren, this is not the place to exhibit to you the proofs, nor is it necessary so to do for your conviction that the confession of our sins, which is a part of the sacrament of penance, is not an invention of men but an institution of Christ. In the Mosaic law, the sinner, when he took to the Aaronitic priest the victim to be offered for his sin, made special confession to that priest by the institution of God. (*Levit.* v.; *Numb.* v. 6, 7.) And in the new law, the Saviour, when he conferred the power of remitting and of retaining sins (*John* xx. 22, 23), commissioned his Apostles, and their ministerial associates and successors, to act with judgment and discrimination in the discharge of this high duty; it would be impossible for them to exercise that judgment, and to make that discrimination, in cases of whose merits they were totally ignorant; and the necessary knowledge could be obtained only by the confession of the sinner. Hence we find St. James exhorting to its practice (*James*, v. 16), as also St. John in his first epistle (I *John* i. 9); and we discover the practice of it amongst the first Christians of the church of Ephesus. (*Acts* xix. 18.) The testimonies of its use are abundant in the universal practice of the earliest

churches, and even they who have separated from us during the first ten centuries, as well as some of a later period, have all retained the practice which they unite with us in declaring to have been derived from the Apostles, and to be of divine origin. It is, indeed, my brethren, humiliating to our pride, but it is salutary to our souls. As there is no dignitary in the church, how high soever his station might be, but is a sinner; and as this has been regulated by the Saviour as the mode in which that sinner is to obtain impartial judgment, wholesome advice, and special application of the law of God to his particular case, so must he have recourse to it, equally as the least distinguished amongst the laity. How afflicting to us, beloved brethren, that our repeated invitations to this holy and necessary practice have been hitherto so comparatively unsuccessful? We know that, besides pride, a variety of other obstacles contribute to deter the irresolute. The difficulty of avowal, the reluctance to desist from habits too long indulged, the backwardness to incur the obligations to be there brought to our minds—as if we were not equally bound, even though we continue absent—the hesitation to approach after so long neglect; these are formidable to the persons who have no contrition; but to the contrite, they present no obstacle; and you deceive yourselves if you endeavour to create the impression of your being contrite, and yet neglect this important institution of the Saviour. Let, then, your contrition be manifest in your preparation and your approach. Let it also be exhibited in those works of satisfaction by which the penitents in the days of the prophets, and of the Saviour, and from that period to the present, have shown that they were united in sentiment with their suffering Saviour.

Doing these things, brethren, you will bring to your souls that peace which the world cannot give; you will become justified through the merits of your Saviour in this holy time. He is the Lamb who was slain for your sins, and by whose blood the angel of destruction is averted from your dwelling, whilst you are about to be brought forth in the liberty of a child of God. Cast out, then, the leaven of iniquity; eat the bitter herbs of contrition, so that you may feed upon the flesh of that victim by whose blood you are redeemed. And may the God of all consolation fill your hearts with his spirit and his love; so that abounding in every good, after tasting of his manna here, you may be brought to that land flowing with eternal delights to which you are led by the angel of a covenant, to which your heavenly Father has pledged himself, and to which we entreat you to be faithful.

Beloved brethren, we pray without ceasing that you may receive every blessing from the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ and the

Holy Ghost, who reign in the unity of his nature, world without end. Amen.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, February 2d, 1831.

LENTEN PASTORAL FOR 1841

John England, by the grace of God and of the Holy See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved brethren, the clergy and laity of the diocess of Charleston—health and blessing.

Beloved Brethren:—The approach of the holy season of Lent reminds us of the duty which we owe to you, by reason of that station which, whatever be our demerits, it has pleased God that we should hold in your regard.

From the earliest days of Christianity the disciples of our blessed Saviour observed, with due solemnity, the great fast which preceded the festival of Easter, and whatever variations of discipline the differing circumstances of nations and of times may have required, there has never been a departure from the observance itself.

The sixty-eighth of the Apostolic canons enacts, that "If any bishop, or priest, or deacon, or chaunter does not fast the forty days of the pasch, or the fourth day and the parasceve [16] unless he is hindered on account of bodily weakness, let him be deposed, but if it be a laic let him be separated."

It was to the same effect that the Council of Gangres made their 19th canon: "If any one of those who are under the determination of continency, being proud, except in the case of bodily necessity, shall think that the common fasts of the whole church may be contemned, he being come to the full use of reasonable knowledge. Let him be anathema." So in the fiftieth canon of the Council of Laodicea, celebrated a few years previously, it was enacted that during the whole Lent, besides fasting, there should be a very rigid abstinence, such as the Easterns were remarkable for observing; by the next canon it was forbidden to celebrate the festivals of the martyrs during Lent, except on the Sabbaths (Saturdays) or Sundays, for the general custom of the Easterns was, not to fast on Saturday; by the fifty-second canon, it was forbidden to celebrate marriages or to observe the birthday fes-

[16] Wednesday and Friday.

tivals in this holy time, as being incompatible with the penitential spirit of the season.

The martyr St. Ignatius, the disciple and companion of St. John the Evangelist, in his letter to the Philippians, tells them—"Do not despise the fast of Lent, for it contains an exhibition of the conversation of our Lord."

In the fifth book of the Apostolic constitutions (chap xii.) we read —"After which days you are to observe the fast of Lent, which contains the remembrance of the life of Christ and of the law that was given. Let this fast be celebrated before the fast of Easter beginning on Monday and ending with the sixth day,[17] then laying aside the fast, begin the holy week of Easter. All of you will therefore fast with fear and trembling, praying in those days for them who are exposed to perish."

The fathers of the eighth Council of Toledo complain in strong terms of the gluttony of those who, without the excuses which they specify, are guilty of the violation of the fast or of the abstinence of Lent:—not only does the ninth chapter of the acts of that council charge those who eat flesh-meat in that season, with being guilty of violating the resurrection of the Lord, but enacts, that they shall not be admitted to communion at Easter, and that they shall be kept, as penance, from the use of flesh-meat for a whole year. It further enacts, that they whom age has bowed down, or weakness has extenuated, or necessity straitens, shall not presume of their own authority to take what is prohibited, until after they shall have obtained the judgment of the priest.

In the third Council of Braga, it was directed by the ninth canon, that on or about the festival of Christmas, every bishop and priest should announce to the people, after the Gospel, the first day of Lent, so that they may have timely warning; it then proceeds to specify the processions and litanies, the psalms and masses with which the observance was to be entered upon, and also the precept regarding the fast.

The ancient holy writers of the church have given us their testimony also upon the subject. I shall instance but a few.

St. Basil in his Discourse ii., "On Fasting," treating of Lent, says; "All equally hear the precept and receive it with joy. . . . There are angels who take account of those who fast, throughout the different

[17] In most ancient documents, "the fast of Easter" means what we now call the Holy Week—and "the great fast," or that of "Lent" was the preceding portion of what we now call "Lent."

The overlooking of this ancient distinction has caused inextricable confusion to several writers.

churches. Look well to it, that you do not suffer great loss because of a little gratification in your victuals; look that you be not omitted by the angel in his catalogue; that you render not yourself guilty of the deserter's crime in the eye of him who inspects the army."

St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, in his 31st sermon says,—"Whatsoever Christian will not fulfil the duty of the consecrated Lent by fasting, will be held guilty of prevarication and contumacy—because by dining, he violates the law divinely given for his salvation. . . . Tell me, I ask you who dine in Lent, if you do not feel yourselves guilty in your own consciences, when you alone are gorging, contrary to the precept of the Lord, at the time that the whole people are abstaining? In his 39th sermon we read the following passage: 'It is a sacrilege to be guilty of a total neglect of Lent: it is a sin to commit a partial violation.' "

St. Jerome in his Epistle to Marcella, against the errors of Montanus—"We, according to the tradition of the Apostles, fast one Lent at its proper time. Not that it is not lawful to fast through the whole year, Pentecost excepted; but because it is one thing to offer a gift by reason of necessity, another thing to do so by choice."

Theophilus of Alexandria, in his third letter of the Pasch or Easter, states that from the beginning, there was always a law in the church to abstain from flesh-meat during Lent, and that they who privately violated this law were held to be highly criminal.

The fifth canon of the great Council of Nice, in 325, had amongst other regulations fixed that two councils should be held yearly in each province, one of which was to be celebrated before the Lent. As the period for observing the fast of Lent was regulated by the festival of Easter, and this was to be fixed by astronomical calculation, Alexandria having at this period the best astronomical school, it was made the duty of the patriarch of this see to have the cycle of movable feasts for the succeeding year communicated to the Holy See, and published in sufficient time for the knowledge of the Christian world.

The following extracts from the publications made by Theophilus, will give to us a view of the mode of the observance. It is from his first letter to the bishops of Egypt.

"To commence our way by penance of the approaching fasts, we begin the Lent on the thirteenth day of the month of Mechir, and the week of holy Easter on the fifth day of the month of Pharamuth, ending the fasts according to the apostolical traditions on the evening of Saturday, on the tenth day of that month, and immediately at the dawn-

ing of Sunday, we will celebrate the Lord's festival, on the eleventh day of the same month."

His third letter is nearly in the same terms.

"The fasts of the holy Lent will commence on the eleventh day of the month of Pharmenoth, and those of the week of the Lord's passion, on the sixteenth day of the month of Pharamuth,—and we will terminate the fasts on the evening of Saturday the twenty-first day of the same month of Pharamuth, and on the following day, Sunday, we will celebrate Easter on the twenty-second day of the same month."

Its observance was thus described by St. Basil, in the discourse from which I have previously given an extract.

"There is no island, no region, no province, no city, no nation, in fine, no place however distant or difficult of access, to which this proclamation of the fast has not reached; nay, the very cohorts of soldiers, they who journey, sailors, merchants, all in fine, of whatsoever discription they are, hear this edict of the fast and embrace it with a joyful mind. Wherefore let no one exclude himself, and let no one separate himself from the rank of those who fast, in which order the entire race of man, every age, every degree of dignity is numbered."

St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, has very many passages, from which I select the following, found in his sixty-second sermon "Of the time."

"To fast on other days may be useful as a remedy, or for merit; to neglect fasting in Lent is sinful."

We could, beloved brethren, multiply witnesses, but they that have been adduced will suffice to show you that this holy observance is one of those apostolical institutions which is a portion of the earliest and universal discipline of the church: for in the testimony laid before you and that which could be produced, it is exhibited as an original apostolic institution binding, as to its observance, upon all, under penalty of sin.

You are fully aware that the Lent is a period of fast and abstinence before the festival of Easter. This was not the only period of fasting and humiliation that was established by the ancient discipline, but it was the principal, and it was therefore often called by pre-eminence "the fast"—sometimes "the great fast," and from the number of days (forty) it was called "Quadragesima," or forty. It was also called the fast of "the spring;" and the ancient Saxon name for "spring" being Lenten, this was called the "Lenten fast," more compendiously "the Lent."

A learned writer[18] commenting on the twenty-third canon of the ancient Council of Elvira, which regulated fasts and abstinences for all the months of the year except those of July and August, which were passed over for their unhealthiness, refers to several ancient authors and documents to show that the object of the Apostles and of their successors was the same in establishing this discipline of the Christian church, as was that for the institution of fast and abstinence by the Almighty for his people under the law of the patriarchs and that of Moses. We shall find it in the following extract:—

"To that end they instituted the Lenten fast: first, that by the penance of fasting in those days they may wash away the stains which they had contracted during the rest of the year; also, that, as the blessed Gregory taught, we should return to the author of that life which we enjoy, the tithes of the whole year."

An Enchyridion or manual of the modern Greek schismatical church, shows us how they preserve the ancient discipline regarding this holy time. In its chapter iv., is the following passage:—

"The Greeks observe four Lents every year. The first is called the great and holy Lent: this continues during the forty-eight days that precede immediately the festival of Easter; but the fast which they observe in this holy Lenten time consists in this, that they use dry food, and this is done because of the crucifixion of Christ, and for the tithing of life."

It then enters into the reason of that tithing, and states that the Greeks fast only on five days each week, as Saturday and Sunday are not fast days with them. It proceeds:—

"But there is a difference perceived between the fasts of the monks and of seculars, and it consists herein, that the seculars can on those five days eat oil and drink wine upon obtaining permission, when they confess [their particularly detailed condition to their] ghostly father; but the use of oil or wine is not at all granted to the monks on those five days by [the priests to whom they make their] confession; they are kept strictly to the fast, by the canon, unless sickness or any necessary cause exclude them."

The discipline of the church has been reviled on this as on almost every other point by some dogmatizers, one of the earliest of whom was Montanus, a native of Ardaban in Mysia, who lived in the second century, together with his two prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla, into whom he asserted the Holy Ghost had descended, to redeem a world which neither Moses nor our Lord Jesus Christ could

[18] Ferdinand Mendoza.

save. Pretending to greater piety, and aspiring to higher perfection than the Apostles, he taught that the observances of a single Lent would not suffice and he established several through the year. It was of him that Appollonius observed, (*Hist. Euseb.* l.v.c. 18.), "This is he who laid on the laws of fastings," and against whose followers St. Jerome wrote upwards of a century later. "We (the Catholics) observe according to the tradition of the Apostles, one Lent at the proper time."

On the other extreme was Eustathius, who, in opposition to the church, went so far as to declare that all days which were commanded to be observed, as days of fasting, were not only not of obligation, but that if persons chose to fast, they would do well to select other days and not to observe those of precept: hence he selected the Sundays and solemn festivals as the periods when he fasted. In this he was sustained by the monk Arius, who for a time became his intimate friend, and who by reason of disappointed ambition first taught the equality of order of bishop and priest, and the inutility of prayers for the dead. He dogmatized towards the latter part of the fourth century. St. Epiphanius in his account of the 75th heresy writes, as his, the following declaration, "Nor is there any reason for instituting a fast. These are all peculiarities of the Jews, and subject us to a sort of yoke of servitude: because there is no law for the just, but only for the slayers, of fathers and of mothers and such like. And if I should at all determine to fast, I will fast on what day I please, of my own accord, and with perfect liberty."

The whole church testified against this novelty, proclaiming in a variety of ways and from various quarters, that it was the subversion of the pure faith and of the ancient and original discipline. The sect formed by Arius, became extinct within a century.

It was against the followers of Eustathius that the fathers of Gangres enacted their nineteenth canon which I have already noticed. These persons taught that after a certain period of probation, they arrived at so perfect a state, as to be free from all obligation of law and incapable of sin.

We have thus seen, beloved brethren, that in the earliest ages of Christianity this Lenten observance was received as an evidently Apostolical institution and that it was opposed only by those who, after two or three centuries, began the introduction of novelties, and were separated from the church. It is, indeed, matter of deep regret that we should find ourselves at all under the necessity of recurring to those ancient testimonies to impress upon the members of the church

the evidence of that authority upon which their holy usages are sustained. But in these days the spirit of the world has so far gained ascendency over the spirit of the Gospel, that men easily yield to the allurements of indulgence; and accustomed to hear our solemn observances ridiculed as superstitious introductions of a comparatively modern and dark period, they are easily drawn, under the pretext of liberty and science, to believe that every high-sounding assertion of this kind is entitled to some credence.

It is said, however, by many of those who oppose us, that we have no scripture warrant for our discipline, and that Christians are subject to no law but to that which is found in holy writ.

Let us give a brief consideration to this last assertion. That a Christian is bound by no law but to that which is written in the Holy Scriptures. Such never was the principle of Christianity. The Christian principle is, that we are bound only by the law of God. And it is assuming too much, to say that all the law is contained in those sacred books which we acknowledge to be his word, and which have come down to us in the custody of that church which the Apostle St. Paul styles, "the pillar and ground of truth." Nor have we any other mode by which we may know that they are God's word, but by her testimony: and we can perceive no distinction between that testimony when it witnesses to us, "this book has been written centuries since under the inspiration of Heaven, and is authentic and unchanged," and when it witnesses, "various opinions have been given by different individuals concerning the doctrine taught in this book, but I testify to you, that from the beginning it has been this which I announce." The church derives her commission to testify in each case precisely from the same source. "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever, I command you: and behold I am with you all days to the consummation of the world." (*Matt.* xxviii. 19, 20.) In this, the commission to teach, all days to the consummation of the world, is clearly bestowed, and there is no restriction as to the mode. St. Mark, in his chap. xvi. v. 20, exhibits to us one mode. "But they, going forth, preached everywhere." St. Luke, in Acts xv., shows us another mode. 6. "And the Apostles and ancients assembled to consider of this matter." 28, "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no farther burthen upon you than those necessary things." St. Paul exhibits to us another mode (II *Tim.* iii. 16): "All scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct in justice." And St. John the Evangelist

informs us that the Holy Scriptures are not a full and perfect exhibition thereof, when he wrote the following, as the last words that ever were indited by the pen of inspiration. "But there are also many other things which Jesus did, which, if they were written, every one, the world itself, I think, would not be able to contain the books that should be written," (xxi. 25.) Thus the church has never admitted the principle, that nothing is obligatory as the law of God, save what is found in the Holy Scriptures.

Nor is it the fact that we do not find in these sacred books the enactments of God for the observance of stated times of solemn penitential fasting; I shall instance but a few.

In the sixteenth chapter of *Leviticus* v. 30, we find a precept for a stated fast, "Upon this day shall be the expiation for you, and the cleansing from all your sins: you shall be cleansed before the Lord. 31. For it is a sabbath of rest, and you shall afflict your souls by a perpetual religion." This is repeated in *Numbers* xxix. 7. This fast of the seventh month is mentioned amongst others by *Zacharias* viii. 19. "Thus saith the Lord of hosts. The fast of the fourth month, and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth, shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness and great solemnities: only love truth and peace." It was to this fast of the tenth month that St. Luke alludes to in *Acts* xxvii. 9. Besides these fasts of precept we find the prophets frequently exhorting this people to several voluntary fasts on particular occasions, and we also find their best and holiest men, and not unfrequently their whole people observing them.

Indeed some of the leaders in that unfortunate separation which, about three centuries ago, made so fearful a breach in the Christian body, do not deny these facts; for the Wirtemberg divines declare, "We are not ignorant of the fact that in the Old Testament there were fasts commanded for stated times, especially before the festival of reconciliation or of atonement." But they remark respecting those fasts. "These children's guides belonged to the Old Testament. And the Apostles sometimes observed the custom of fasting, not indeed as anything necessary, but lest they should be a stumbling block to the Jews; and because they had been accustomed thereto; and that they might bury Moses and his ceremonies with honour."

Now we desire to exhibit to you, the principle upon which the fact, which is admitted, vindicates our discipline: and that previous difficulties may be removed, we lay before you the precise value of the fast itself. God as the legislator of the Jewish people held a

relation to them which he does not hold to the Christian. He gave to them a political constitution and a civil code which regarded only them and are not obligatory upon us. All parts of the Old Testament containing such precepts, are, so far as we are concerned, then, repealed: indeed they no longer exist, for they were only the constitution and laws of a nation which is now no more: the descendants of that people being at present incorporated with various nations under whose constitutions they live, and by whose laws they are bound.

God also gave to them an ecclesiastical and ritual code whose ceremonial foreshadowed the Redeemer, in whom they were to terminate, and that church which he was to establish: and the code was at the period of his arrival to be of no obligation, and as his church was organized, the rite was to give way to what it foreshadowed. This ceremonial law forms no part of Christianity, the hierarchy of Judea has long since ceased to exist, and as it is now impossible to trace the Aaronitical or the Levitical pedigree, it is equally impossible that it should ever even have the semblance of a restoration.

But God, as the great object of man's adoration, demanded homage equally from the Jew as he does from the Christian. The great unchangeable doctrines of truth which he revealed to the former are equally objects of faithful belief for the latter. He also gave a code for the moral guidance of man, and this is equally binding upon both, it was not and it cannot be repealed. He also taught man several great principles of religion in both those modes, viz.: the revelation of doctrine, and the legislation for morals. And the principles thus emanating from him were as unchangeable as himself.

One of those principles is, that for the repentant sinner a most useful and wholesome exercise is fasting; another is, that the sinner ought to repent and to pray for mercy. Another, that he should cease to do evil and learn to do good. These and many such principles form the essential and unchanging part of religion under every dispensation of his providence, whether his children are led by the patriarch, the Levite, or the Apostle.

It is a principle of religion that the penitent sinner ought to fast. It is also a principle of religion that the laws of the religious society which God has established are binding upon its members. If then the patriarch, legislating for his family, enacts that on a particular day the duty of a particular religious observance shall be obligatory, the enactment requires it to be performed on that day. The Sanhedrim had a like power in the Jewish nation, and so had the Apostles, and so have their successors in the Christian church.

Having then before us the great example of the Almighty himself, binding the Jews to the observance of this act of religion at a special and stated time, the lawfulness and the usefulness of so doing, are unquestionably established; and we have the fullest evidence that, upon this principle, the obligation of the Lenten observance is lawful and complete. This affords the highest scriptual evidence of the soundness of the principle upon which it rests.

Not only did the chosen people of God observe the stated fasts, but it was very usual with them to add voluntary observances.—Thus in *Numbers* xxx. 14: "If she vow and bind herself by oath to afflict her soul, by fasting or abstinence from other things, it shall depend upon the will of her husband whether she shall do it, or do it not." It is written in commendation of Judith viii. 6, that "she wore hair-cloth upon her loins, and fasted all the days of her life except the Sabbaths, and new moons and the feasts of the house of Israel." In *Psalm* xiii. v. 13, the afflicted sinner turning to God for consolation, says: "But as for me, when they were troublesome to me, I was clothed with hair-cloth. I humbled my soul with fasting." And again, when filled with sentiments of contrition for sin. *Psalm* lxviii. 11: "I covered my soul in fasting; and it was made a reproach to me. 12. And I made hair-cloth my garment, and I became a by-word to them." And again, in *Psalm* cviii. 24: "My knees are weakened through fasting, and my flesh is changed for oil." So in *Luke* ii. 37, it is said in commendation of Anna, the prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, "who departed not from the temple by fastings and prayers, serving night and day." Nothing can then be more fully evinced than that this was considered a work of great piety and of appropriate penance.

It is equally manifest in the sacred volume, that it was considered a most efficacious mode of obtaining the divine favour. This is evinced by the frequent recourse hereto by those who stood in need of that aid, and by numerous instances of their complete success, as well as by the exhortation of the priests and of the prophets to its practice on such occasions.

In the case of David's repentance. (II *Kings* xii. 16.) "And David besought the Lord for the child; and David kept a fast, and going in by himself lay upon the ground." So in *Judith* chapter iv. 7; "And all the people cried to the Lord with great earnestness, and they humbled their soul in fasting and prayers, both they and their wives." "10. Then Eliachim the high priest of the Lord went about all Israel and spoke to them. 11. Saying: know ye that the Lord will

hear your prayers, if you continue with perseverance in fastings and prayers in the sight of the Lord." And in this case the result verified the assurance of the priest. When Israel had been twice defeated in their effort to punish Benjamin, we are informed (*Judges* xx. 26), "Wherefore all the children of Israel came to the house of God; and sat and wept before the Lord, and they fasted that day till evening, and offered him holocausts and victims of peace-offerings." 27. And inquired of him concerning their state. He directed them and they were successful. So in the chapter vii. of the *First Book of Kings,* we read that when under the guidance of Samuel they repented, and v. 6, fasted, confessing their sins, the Lord received them into favour.

We have a notable instance of its efficacy in the case of Achab (*III Kings* xxi.), where the denunciations of the Lord by the mouth of Elias the holy Thesbite made him enter into himself: 27. "And when Achab heard these words, he rent his garments, and put hair-cloth upon his flesh and fasted and slept in sack-cloth, and walked with his head cast down." Yet though he was grievously criminal and had for the purpose of procuring murder by perjury, with the semblance of piety and justice, been accessory to the crime of Jezabel, the prophet was informed by God that the evil should not be brought upon his house, in the day of the penitent Achab.

So (II *Paralipomenon* xx. 3), we read how in the day of their distress Josaphat proclaimed a fast for all Juda, and the land was delivered. So (in II *Esdras* viii. 21), he informs us—"And I proclaimed a fast by the river Ahava, that we might afflict ourselves before the Lord our God, and might ask of him a right way for us and for our children, and for all our substance." The result is found in v. 23: "And we fasted and besought our God for this, and it fell out prosperously unto us." All this is perfectly consonant to the doctrine promulgated by the Angel to Tobias (xii. 8): "Prayer is good with fasting and alms, more than to lay up treasures of gold."

We read also of Esther when she was surrounded with difficulties (iv. 15): "She sent to Mardochai in these words, 16. Go: and gather together all the Jews whom thou shall find in Susan, and pray ye for me, neither eat, nor drink for three days, and three nights: and I and my handmaids will fast in like manner, and then I will go into the king, against the law, not being called, and expose myself to death and danger." You are aware of her complete success; you find further evidences and descriptions in ix. 31, and xiv. 2.

Thus when it was sought to bring the house of Israel from its iniquities and to supplicate the Lord for mercy, we read, in *Jeremias*

xxxvi. 9, "that they proclaimed a fast before the Lord to all the people in Jerusalem, and to all the people that were come together out of the cities of Juda to Jerusalem." And we are informed in Baruch, that when he read his prophecy to the captive king and his companions in the land of Babylon, 5, "when they heard it, they wept and fasted and prayed before the Lord," and having made a collection of money they sent it to Jerusalem to have sacrifices offered in the temple for the remission of their sins (v. 13). Daniel, when intreating favours from the Lord, set his face to the Lord his God to pray and make supplication with fasting and sack-cloth and ashes (ix. 3.) Joel, when he calls upon Israel to save itself by repentance, thus warns it: "Sanctify ye a fast, call an assembly, gather together the ancients, all the inhabitants of the land into the house of your God: and pray ye to the Lord, (i. 14.) Now, therefore, saith the Lord, be converted to me with all your heart, in fasting and in weeping and in mourning, (ii. 12.) Blow the trumpet in Sion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly." (15.)

Need I draw your attention to the salvation of Ninive, by fasting, upon the principle laid down by its monarch. "Who can tell if God will turn and forgive, and will turn away from his fierce anger, and we shall not perish?" (*Jonas,* iii. 9.)

So we read in I *Macchabees,* iii., that when the band of devoted heroes who suffered so greatly for the protection of their country and of their religion, were on the eve of battle under great disadvantage, "47. They fasted that day and put on hair-cloth, and ashes on their heads," and the God of their fathers enabled them to triumph over their opponents.

We have a similar history in II *Macchabees* xii. 12: "So when they had done this together, and had craved the mercy of the Lord, with weeping and fasting, lying on the ground three days continually, Judas exhorted them to make themselves ready." They did, and assailed their enemies with a successful result.

It is therefore, manifest, that amongst God's holy people, previously to the Saviour's arrival, not only voluntary and occasional fasts were considered as peculiarly necessary for penitents, and useful for those who besought favours from heaven, but also that there were solemn fasts, by precept, at stated times and on special occasions. And thus it was a uniform principle of religion that this holy practice was not only useful but was occasionally of obligation; and, moreover, that the ecclesiastical authority had power to require its observance.

Though the Christian is not bound by the legislation of the

Sanhedrim, since the legislative power has been transferred to the apostolic tribunal, yet the great principle remains unchanged. Nor is the New Testament wanting in ample evidence to show its continued force.

In the *Gospel of St. Mark,* i. 6, and from the lips of the Saviour, we have testimony of the austerity of John the Baptist, (*Matt.* xi. 18.) Having learned of their mortified teacher, the disciples of John were found frequently observing this religious practice; as were also the Pharisees who professed a strict observance of the law of their God. "There came to him the disciple of John, saying, why do we and the Pharisees fast often, but thy disciples do not fast?" (*Matt.* ix. 14; *Mark* ii. 18, and so forth.) The Saviour, so far from condemning the practice, points out to them the period when his disciples will fast. Again, he instructs his disciples as to the manner in which they should fast; exhibiting to them the hypocrisy of the Pharisees, who gave to men the indications of their mortification that they might be honoured for that virtue which they pretended to practice. The blessed Jesus tells his disciples to perform the virtuous deed that they may please God, not to seek applause from men. (*Matt.* vi. 16, 17, 18.)

Again, he shows not only its utility but its necessity, when he informs his disciples that there were some devils not to be cast out save by prayer and fasting, (*Matt.* xvii. 20; *Mark* ix. 28.) Nor in teaching this lesson did he confine his view to the mere ejection from the body. He conveyed a more sublime and moral lesson respecting the delivery of the soul from the influence of the destroyer, by the combined influence of prayer and fasting. Thus in the gospels the evidence exists, that the Saviour inculcated that same principle which we have seen pervading the religion of so many centuries before.

We now proceed to the view of that period when the bridegroom having been taken away, the time had arrived in which the Saviour said his disciples were to fast. And we find the work of their ministry accompanied by fasting. "And as they were ministering to the Lord and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them: separate to me Saul and Barnabas for the work whereunto I have taken them. Then they fasting, and praying, and imposing hands upon them, sent them away." (*Acts* xiii. 2, 3.) "And when they had ordained to them priests in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord in whom they believed." (*Acts* xiv. 22.)

And for the conduct of the others, we may take, for an instance, that of St. Paul, who informs us, (I *Cor.* ix. 27,) "I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection; lest, perhaps, when I have preached

to others, I myself should become a castaway." And he again exhibits to us the mode in which this was done, by exhorting the Corinthians to pursue a special rule of conduct, in which we find, "in watchings, in fastings, in chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness," and so forth. (II *Cor.* vi. 5, 6,) and in the same epistle he exhibits himself "in labour and painfulness, in much watchings, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often," and so forth, (xi. 27.)

Nothing can, therefore, be more unfounded than the assertion, that fasting is not sustained as of utility and of obligation, by the Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testament.

It was about the year 225, that Tertullian, in the second chapter of his book "On Fasting," wrote, "Truly, they consider that those are the days determined in the Gospel for fasting, in which the bridegroom has been taken away; and those are the only days of lawfully fixed Christian fasting, the ancient fasts and those of the prophets having been abolished." And in his 13th chapter, he says, admitting, even when he became a Montanist, the interpretation of the church, that the Lent fixed by the Apostles, was the period alluded to by the Saviour; "For, behold, I agree that when you fast on other days besides the Easter, you do it besides those days in which the bridegroom is taken away." In another place he asserts, "The Apostles observed the Lent, laying on no other yoke of certain fasts, to be observed in common by all persons." He, elsewhere, mentions at this period various councils, in Grecce and elsewhere, regulating this matter, or as Eusebius more fully explained it, (l. v. c. 23,) where he describes councils in Asia, examining the tradition derived from the Apostles, regarding the precise day on which the fast derived from the Apostles was to cease, and Easter be celebrated. Thus, St. Leo the Great, in his sermon 6, caput, 2, describes it as "An apostolic institution, to be filled up in its observance, by fasts of forty days."

Passing over a mass of other evidence, it must be now plain, from what I have produced, that no observance of our religion claims a more high or venerable antiquity, or rests upon a better foundation.

A few words may be allowed respecting its duration. The six weeks before Easter are generally supposed to have been the original period of the observance. The Apostles had as their prototype, the forty days and forty nights that our blessed Lord fasted in the desert, (*Matt.* iv.) This number has been indicated as the period during which God had showered destruction on a sinful world, (*Gen.* vii.) This was the period during which Moses conversed with the Lord, and fasted on the mountain, (*Exod.* xxxiv. 28.) This was the number of days

that the holy prophet Elias walked, without food, to the mountain of God, after having been moderately fed by the angel, (III *Kings,* xix. 8.) Hence the Sunday at which this observance began, was called "Quadragesima," or "forty;" but as the Lord's day was not a fast, there were only thirty-six; upon which ground, Pope St. Telesphorus, the ninth from St. Pteer, before the year 150, to complete the number of days, ordered the fast to commence on the previous week, or "Quinquagesima." In the eastern portion of the church, however, they did not fast on Saturdays, and, therefore, to supply this deficiency they began a week still earlier, or on "Sexagesima." The Emperor Heraclius, by reason of a vow that he made when his army was in a critical position, added a week of abstinence even before this, which custom was piously observed by many in the East. At present, the discipline of the Western portion of the church is, to begin on Ash-Wednesday, so that, excluding the Sundays, there will be forty days of fast.

From the early ages of the church, the Christians were accustomed to assemble in the church, and to commence this holy observance, by the ceremony of having ashes placed on their heads, to remind them of their origin from dust, and of the end to which all worldly vanity and pomp, and pride shall return, by reason of sin: this is a lesson older in religion, that is Christianity itself. The prophets and the holy ones of old, have taught it to all penitents, and whatever may be the cavillings of a cold mockery of philosophy, bereft of the soul of religion, man must cease to be what God has made him, before he will be unaffected by the impressions thus made on his senses.

There is a distinction between fasting and abstinence amongst us. With the Greeks, abstinence included fasting.

Abstinence regards the quality of the food; fasting regards the quantity. We abstain from certain kinds of food, not considering them, as the Manicheans did, "not good," or "made by the evil principle," and "not by God." We look upon all that has been made by God to be good, and to be received with thanksgiving at its proper time. Nor do we look upon any to be "unclean," as was the case in the Jewish law; and this is proved by our eating on one day what we abstain from upon another day. Our abstinence is for the purpose of mortification, and of bringing the flesh in subjection to the spirit. Our abstinence is penitential and salutary; penitential as it mortifies us, and makes us feel inconvenience, salutary as it restrains passion. Its principle, together with an example, are found in that of Daniel, x. 3: "I eat no desirable bread, and neither flesh nor wine entered my mouth,

neither was I anointed with ointment, till the days of three weeks were accomplished." With us, it consists chiefly in avoiding the use of flesh-meat. With our predecessors in the faith, and with our brethren in other regions, it means much more; for, alas! beloved brethren, our discipline has been exceedingly relaxed. We have another instance, in the case of St. John the Baptist, who used only locusts and wild honey. (*Matt.* iii. 4.) Clement of Alexandria, informs us (lib. ii. c. 1, *De Pœdag.*) that the Apostle St. Matthew used only vegetables. St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his oration "On the Love of the Poor," tells us that St. Peter lived on the worth of an exceedingly small coin of lupines, daily. Eusebius tells us, (*Hist.* lib. ii. c. 22,) that St. James never used flesh-meat or wine. The disciples of St. Mark, at Alexandria, were described by Philo and others, as always abstaining from flesh-meat. I could adduce witnesses to any desirable extent, from the first four or five centuries of the Christian period, to show the extent of the abstinence of the fervent disciples of those days, and especially to show that very few thought of using flesh-meat on a day of fasting; that they generally abstained from wine and oil; that in many instances they did not use fish, or butter, or cheese, and that it was scarcely ever permitted on the days of any fast to use an egg. In several churches, they used only coarse bread and dry fruits.

I shall quote a very few passages. *Apostolic Constitutions,* lib. v. c. 17: "Do you then fast on the days of the Easter, beginning from the second day of the week, even to the sixth and the Sabbath (Saturday), taking salt, herbs, and water to the table; abstain on those days from wine and flesh-meat, for they are days of grief, and not of festivity."

Tertullian writing of this week, in his book "On Fasting:" "Because we observe also the days of dry eating (Xerophagias), drying our food from all flesh-meat, and everything that is juicy, and from very new apples, lest we should eat or drink anything that is vinous."

St. Epiphanius, treating of the seventy-fifth heresy, mentions the *Apostolic Constitutions*: "They define that during the six paschal days, nothing at all is to be taken by way of food, save bread, salt, and water."

St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, in his Cateches. 4: "Let us fast, and let us abstain from wine and flesh-meat, not regarding their use always as criminal, and abhorring them, but expecting a reward."

St. John Chrysostom to the people of Antioch, Homily 5, mentions some who, during Lent, abstained not only from meat and wine and oil, but from every sort of dish, using only bread and water; and in his

Homily 6, he tells: "Should you be urged a thousand times, and even tormented by their calls, to force you to drink wine, or to taste anything not allowed by the discipline of the fast, you should rather suffer anything, than touch the prohibited food."

The fast is generally understood as eating only once in the twenty-four hours; but we have several instances of not only individuals and communities of religious persons, but of whole churches, fasting altogether from food for two or even three days. The usage, however, is to eat once in the day, and that one meal to be taken in the evening: thus in *Judges* xx. 26, and many other places, it is described, "and they fasted that day until evening." Tertullian, after he became a Montanist, reproaches the Catholics as violators of the fast, because they took their meal after the ninth hour was celebrated, or about four or five o'clock in the afternoon, and did not defer it, as the Montanists did, until after vespers or sunset; yet, in many places, the Catholics followed that discipline of not taking food until after vespers, and it is thought to be the original and most ancient.

St. Athanasius, in his book "On Virginity:" "After communion, at the ninth hour, eat thy bread, giving thanks to God over thy table."

Philostorgus: "The fast of the fourth day of the week and of the Parasceve, consists not only in abstaining from flesh-meat, but is defined by the canons to be, that no food, whatever, should be taken before evening."

St. Epiphanius, (*Expos. fidei, contra hær*), "On the fourth day, and that before the Sabbath (Friday, the fast is appointed to the ninth hour; but, for the entire Lent, after the ninth hour in the evening.

A great many other exhibitions of testimony may be made, but this will suffice to show in what consists the difference between fasting and abstinence.

Subsequent authorities and usages which obtained the force of law, have made it now allowable to take this one meal at any hour after noon.

Thus, by the general law of the church, every day from Ash-Wednesday to the Saturday before Easter, both included, is a day of abstinence from flesh-meat; and every day of them, Sundays excepted, is a day of obligation to fast on one meal, which meal cannot be taken before noon; and to this observance all are bound, who have attained the age of twenty-one years, with the exception of those who shall be hereafter specified.

And though persons who have not attained the above-mentioned

age are exempted from the obligation of the fast, they are bound to the observance of the abstinence, from the period of their being capable of understanding the meaning and the force of that precept.

Alas! beloved brethren, how lamentable a spectacle are we doomed to witness, in beholding so many for whose souls we are so deeply accountable, and who make so little scruple of deliberately violating this salutary law, this weighty obligation? Would to God they could be induced to enter into themselves, and to imbibe some of the sentiments of their predecessors in the faith! They profess to expect salvation only through the blood of Jesus Christ, and upon the conditions that he has established, one of which is, that they should hear his church, and obey her, (*Matthew* xviii. 17.) That church plainly addresses to them precepts of a most salutary description, upon the very principles and according to the directions of that Saviour; and they not only disregard them, but they use every effort by miserable sophistry to undermine her authority. They take up the principles, the practice, and the very arguments of those who would blot her, if they could, from the face of the earth, and yet they call themselves her children? May we not say truly of them, as St. Paul wrote of others?—"For many walk, of whom I have told you often (and now tell you weeping) that they are enemies of the cross of Christ; whose end is destruction, whose God is their belly, whose glory is their shame, who mind earthly things?" (*Philippians* iii. 18, 19.)

In process of time, it became usual with many nations to take their meal, on fasting days, at an earlier instead of a later hour; and having dined soon after noon, the monks assembled, for some time previous to retiring for the night, to hold some spiritual conversation; this they called *collatio*, or "Collation." So late as the thirteenth century, we find, from passages in the writings of St. Thomas of Aquin, that the time of the ninth hour, or about three P. M., was generaly that for eating, and that there was only the single meal. The same would appear to have been the case in the time of Denis, the Carthusian, about the year 1450. We find however, that fifty years later, Stephen, Bishop of Paris, mentions noon to be the usual time on fast days, and this had also been the hour amongst the latter Greeks.

When the monks assembled at collation, they were then furnished, before retiring, with a moderate drink, and subsequently a small piece of bread was added, lest the stomach should be injured by taking the drink alone; and this slight refection obtained the name of "a collation."

The present discipline is, that besides the dinner, a collation,

which should not exceed the fourth part of an ordinary meal in its quantity, nor be composed of any but the most plain and simple quality of food or drink, is permitted in the evening to those who dine early; and custom has, in many places, allowed it to be taken in the morning by those whose dinner-time is late; but it is by no means allowed to take one in the morning, and another in the evening. Milk, in very small quantity, is allowed in tea or coffee; but butter, eggs, or cheese, are not allowed.

We have thus, beloved brethren, entered at considerable length upon the explanation and the history of this holy observance, that you may perceive the solid and venerable ground on which it rests. We shall now briefly remind you of its objects; because we do not contend or imagine that the mere diminution of our usual quantity of food, or the mere abstaining from any particular description of diet, would, of itself, be an act of religious benefit.

Several of our opponents, who charge us with superstition on this head, admit that fasting is useful as a restraint upon impure passions, as, also, as a manifestation of humility, and a sign of penitence. The principal authors of that unfortunate separation, which still divides so many millions of our brethren from us, go to this extent. And, beloved brethren, are not these, especially the first of them, highly beneficial to religion? Indeed, such was the principle upon which St. Paul informs us, as we have before seen, (I *Cor.* ix. 27,) that he chastised his body and brought it into subjection. To this, and to similar passages, the ancient and venerable fathers of the church refer, when they treat of chastity, virginity, and purity of soul; upon this principle it is, that the old morning hymn of the church expresses the sentiment:—

Carnis terat superbiam,
Potûs cibique parcitas.
Let stinted drink and meagre food,
Subdue our pride of flesh and blood.

This was the principle upon which many of the holy persons, whose examples we behold in the Scriptures, had frequent recourse to this holy exercise. And every one is aware of the manner in which the passion is excited by the fulness of meat or the copiousness or quality of drinks. The indulgence of impure passion is probably the most extensive and effectual occasion of the ruin of souls; its subjugation is of the highest consequence, and of the first necessity; and no more effectual remedy is known for this purpose than the observance of this holy discipline.

Our passions are all closely allied, and as the indulgence of one encourages another, and destroys the energy of the soul in their opposition, so the subjugation, or the restraint of one, gives the soul a greater power for the control of all. The habit of abstinence subdues gluttony, gives to the soul the power of command, and thereby enables it with more facility to subdue other irregular appetites; and if we are so feeble as not to be able to resist the desire of eating or of drinking at a particular moment, or a particular food, how shall we be able to overcome more powerful opponents?

Fasting disposes the soul for prayer and heavenly contemplation. The grosser humours are taken away, and the dense atmosphere which fulness creates, is purified. It was by a fast of forty days, that Moses was enabled, upon the elevation of Sinai, to behold and to converse with the Lord, and there to receive his holy law and his salutary ceremonial; there was his heart more inflamed with the divine love, as he was enveloped on the blazing summit. It was after his days of fasting, that the holy Thesbite witnessed the presence of the Lord, in the gentle air that followed the fire upon the mountain, (III *Kings,* xix. 12,). and received his behests. It was by fasting that Daniel prepared himself to behold those visions that foreshadowed the mysterious occurrences of years to be unfolded, and of the portentous days that will precede the dissolution of the world. So, by this holy exercise, has the church, from the earliest period, prepared her children for the celebration of her higher festivals; causing the observance of her vigils, that by fasting and praying, and watching, she may withdraw her charge occasionally from the distractions of this fleeting world, and bring them to the fellowship of their brethren, who, dead to this world, yet were living before God, in company of the holy angels. "Fasting," says St. John Chrysostom, (Hom. i. *In Genes.*) "is the food of our soul; it gives to it light wings, that it may be borne on high and contemplate the most sublime things."

We are called upon to worship God, not only by spiritual homage, but also by our bodies, for He is their creator, and He promises to them a glorious resurrection. And at all periods, fasting and abstinence were considered one mode of religious worship; thus, Anna "departed not from the temple, by fastings and prayers serving night and day." The Apostle St. Paul calls upon the Romans, to "present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, pleasing unto God," (*Rom.* xii. 1.) The great Council of Nice calls it "a clean and holy offering to God." Tertullian testifies the doctrine of the first ages, when he, in his book "On the Resurrection," says that "fasts, late and dry meals, are agreeable

sacrifices to God." Thus, as by the body we offend Him, we are called upon by the body, to pay to Him this homage and testimony of our sorrow, and, as far as we are able, to do penance, by uniting our voluntary afflictions to those which the blessed Saviour voluntarily underwent, that by his bruises we may be healed.

That fasting is a penitential work, befitting sinners, is manifest, from what we have already seen in the holy Scriptures, of the sentiments of the prophets and Apostles, as well as of other holy personages.

The second chapter of Joel is distinct upon the subject. We shall select a very few passages to the same effect from an inexhaustible accumulation that is found in the earliest, the holiest, and the best informed writers that the church has known.

Tertullian, in his book "On Fasting," writes, "This is the groundwork with all regarding emaciation of food, by which, nourishment being forbidden and the precept being observed, the original transgression may be expiated, so that man may give satisfaction to God by the same matter by which he had offended." And again: "As in the beginning the use of food brought on our loss, so fasting might render satisfaction to God."

St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in his sermon "Of the Fallen:" "Let us appease his wrath, for the insult we have given him, with fasting, and tears, and wailings, as he himself admonishes us."

St. Basil, Orat. "On Fasting:" "We fall into sickness by sin, let us be healed by penance; but penance without fasting is idle and fruitless. Satisfy God by fasting."

St. Ambrose, "On Elias and Fasting," Caput 3: "Fasting is the death of guilt, the destruction of sins, the remedy of salvation."

Another great object of this holy exercise is to procure from God his favour and special grace for our necessities, to enable us to overcome temptations and to be strengthened by the divine aid, and even to obtain temporal benefits, when not incompatible with our eternal welfare.

The ancient authors explain the abstinence from food of Anna, the mother of Samuel, (I *Kings* i. 7,) to have been, to intreat that she might obtain the child. That he might by fasting avert the chastisement of God and save the life of his child, was clearly one of the objects of David, (II *Kings* xii.) So in *Tobias* iii. 10, and so forth, we find that Sara fasted to be delivered from her affliction, and her fasting and prayer were successful. To the instances that we have previously given, we may add the special promise made by the blessed

Saviour to those who should fast with becoming dispositions.—*Matt.* vi. 18: "And thy father who seeth in secret will repay thee."

St. Jerome and the Venerable Bede testify the well-known fact, that when St. John was about to write his Gospel at the request of the church, a general fast was enjoined, to obtain God's special blessing upon his undertaking. Clement of Alexandria mentions also the frequent fastings of this blessed Apostle, to obtain from God the conversion of a young man for whom he became interested. Need any farther testimonies be adduced? We shall give two or three very brief but very pertinent passages.

St. Ambrose, in his *Epistle to the Church of Vercelli*, 82, asks, "Who are these new teachers that shut out the merit of fasting?"

St. Athanasius, lib. de Virginit.: "Do you see what fasting can do? It heals sickness, it dries up rheums, it puts devils to flight, it expels wicked thoughts, it renders the heart clean."

St. John Chrysostom, Sermon 1, "On Fasting:" "Fast because you have sinned, fast that you may not sin, fast that you may receive, fast that you may preserve what you have received."

Surely, beloved brethren, we can add nothing to the testimony and the exhortation which thus come to you from such holy and ancient heralds of the Gospel, from so many regions of the world, from so many churches venerable for their sufferings, their piety, their erudition, and their authority; what can we add to the admonitions and the instructions of the Holy Ghost himself speaking through the books of his own inspiration? Shall we not say with the Apostle: "And therefore, we also having so great a cloud of witnesses over our head, laying aside every weight of sin, which surrounds us, let us run by patience to the fight proposed to us: looking on Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith, who having joy proposed to him, endured the cross, despising shame, and now sitteth at the right hand of God. For think diligently upon him that endured such opposition from sinners against himself; that you be not wearied, fainting in your minds. For you have not yet resisted unto blood, striving against sin: and you have forgotten the consolation which speaketh to you as unto children, saying, My son, neglect not the discipline of the Lord; neither be thou wearied whilst thou art rebuked by him. For whom the Lord loveth he chastiseth: and he scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. Persevere under discipline. God dealeth with you as with sons: for what son is there whom the father doth not correct?" (*Heb.* xii. 1 to 7.)

But though fast and abstinence, as to food, were considered the principal external works of mortification to be used in this holy time,

they were not the only ones. In looking through the documents that have come down to us from the earliest period, we perceive that they all agree in the principle and in the details which establish that the mortification was to extend to every mode of indulgence, as the time was one of penance and not of enjoyment. Thus in the canonical rules of the monasteries, we find that during this period they were neither to admit visiters for those purposes that were allowable at other times, nor were any of the monks to go abroad except on the most urgent necessity: they were to occupy their time in prayer, or reading, or labour, as might be directed by the superior; they were to devote much of their day to contemplation and to mental prayer; they were to consider themselves as united with Christ in his devotion to suffering, as a victim for the sins of the world; and to enter into the spirit of that conduct to which Joel invites the priests of old. "Sacrifice and libation is cut off from the house of the Lord: the priests, the ministers of God, have mourned," (i. 9.) "Gird yourselves and lament, O ye priests, howl, ye ministers of the altars: go in, lie in sack-cloth, ye ministers of my God: because sacrifice and libation is cut off from the house of your God, sanctify ye a fast," (i. 13, 14.) And upon this principle, in the eastern division of the church, the holy sacrifice of the Mass was not offered during Lent, except on Saturday and Sunday.

We find, also, pervading all the ancient instructions, and in many instances, even the canons for the laity, that principle which St. Paul lays down for the Corinthians, (I *Cor.* vii. 5,) of continence, to be better disposed for prayer. Hence it is, that from the most remote days, marriage was not solemnized in Lent, not at Easter, nor in Advent nor until after the festival of the Epiphany. This principle was found in the very earliest counsels of Heaven, and in some instances it became matter of precept, as in *Exodus* xix. 15. And throughout the whole period of the Mosaic law, it was extensively applicable; an instance may be seen in I *Kings* xxi. 4, 5.

Amusements, shows, games, and pastimes, which on other occasions are permitted, were always considered to be highly unbecoming, and to take any part in them, or to aid, or to encourage them, even by merely being present thereat, in the time of Lent, was at every period considered to be criminal.

Necessarily, the spirit of the time forbade any entertainments or feasts, all delicacy or careful cooking, the principle being, that food of the most plain description was to be taken, to such moderate extent

as to preserve life, but not to gratify the palate, to excite passion, or to produce indulgence.

We shall exhibit to you a summary of some regulations made for the observance of this solemnity, by Theodulph, Bishop of Orleans, before the close of the eighth century, when discipline had been considerably relaxed.

During the previous week the priests are to attend especially to receiving confessions. The old English world "shrive" means "to confess" for the Sacrament of Penance—whence, this time is called "Shrovetide," or the time of confession. They are to reconcile enemies, to establish charity. The abstinence and fasting are then regulated; alms-deeds are not only recommended but enjoined. Let that which is saved in food or luxury be given to the poor. The words of Daniel to Nabuchodonosor were exhibited: "Redeem your sins with alms, and your iniquities with works of mercy to the poor, and perhaps God would forgive you your offences," (*Dan.* iv. 24.) And the word of the Saviour: "Give alms, and all things are clean to you." (*Luke,* xi.) Temperance, especially in wine, is then strongly inculcated. It is then warmly urged, that the holy communion of our Lord's body should be received on every Sunday. No strife, no contention, no suing for debts, no process of criminal law, and the words of the prophet Isaias are quoted: "Behold in the day of your fast your own will is found and you exact of all your debtors. Behold you fast for debates and for strife, and strike with the fist wickedly," (lviii. 3, 4.) Other works of religion and of charity are inculcated and urged by apposite and cogent motives.

Pope Nicholas I., at a period of about sixty years later, being consulted by the people of Bulgaria, then lately converted, instructs them upon a variety of subjects; the observance of this time of penance forms a principal topic. Besides the subjects that we have noticed, there are a few others that show, both in the questions and the answers, how utterly the great object of this solemnity appears to have been forgotten in our day. They consult him upon the propriety of indulging in the sports of the field, especially in hunting, which he shows to be altogether incompatible with the observance. The courts of law were generally closed, pleadings discontinued, and executions of criminals were suspended. War, except for the purpose of defence against an invading foe, was to be laid aside; amusements were to be by no means tolerated; banquets were strictly forbidden; marriage was to be postponed, and its use to be greatly moderated, if not altogether forborne. For all these, reference is made to the holy Scriptures and to the original usages of

the church. This, beloved brethren, may afford some idea of what the duty of Lent was accounted in better days than those upon which we have fallen.

From what we have thus laid before you, beloved brethren, you can clearly perceive the nature, the object, and the necessity of the Lenten observance: you can perceive its antiquity, its universality, and its obligation. It remains for us to perform that which is our duty, viz.: to make such modifications, by virtue of the authority with which we are vested, as may be required in the general law by the particular circumstances of our diocess, and we regret, indeed, that they demand so great a relaxation as we feel at present constrained to make:—

1. Every person having attained the age of twenty-one years is bound to fast on one meal in the twenty-four hours, during the entire Lent, except the Sundays.

The following are the exemptions:—Persons actually sick or convalescent. Persons of exceedingly delicate constitution, whose health would be seriously endangered by the observance. Persons whose occupation is so laborious as that they could not perform the indispensable duties if they observed the fast; such as day-labourers and mechanics employed in heavy labours, persons who are bearing or nursing children, and persons whose poverty will not insure to them a certainty of having one sufficient meal in the day.

Great inconvenience is not considered necessity. Penance is of its own nature inconvenient.

2. A collation is allowed, which should not exceed the fourth part of an ordinary meal. Milk is allowed in small proportion in either tea or coffee when taken. Neither butter, eggs, or cheese are allowed.

3. The general rule is, that every day is one of abstinence from flesh-meat.

A dispensation is granted to use flesh-meat at any time on all the Sundays in Lent, and at dinner only, on Monday, Tuesday, and Thursday in every week, except the first and the last weeks.

It is by no means allowed to use flesh-meat and fish at the same meal.

4. Neither milk, butter, eggs, or cheese, are to be used in any way on Good Friday.

5. Except in the most manifest cases, no person is to presume a dispensation from the fast, without the approbation of the regular clergyman.

6. It is recommended strongly that all persons who have it in their power, will attend daily at the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and at the

other devout exercises and instructions. When they cannot do so daily, let them do so as frequently as they may be able.

7. Let all be constant in prayer, in self-examination, in cherishing sentiments of true repentance, affectionate charity, and in reading the Holy Scriptures and other good books.

8. Let a spirit of fervent piety be entertained and encouraged; let preparation be duly made for the sacraments; let the sufferings of our Redeemer be kept in constant remembrance, and a fixed determination be made to persevere in the amendment of life.

9. Let alms-deeds, justice, and mercy be exhibited to all our brethren of every condition and creed, and let the peace and charity of God dwell amongst us.

Then, beloved brethren, will those days be to us a time of salvation, then will it be an acceptable time, in which, through the merits of Jesus Christ, the mercy of our Heavenly Father will be extended to us. "Then shall our light break forth as the morning, and our health will speedily arise. The places that have been desolated for ages, shall be built in us, and foundations shall be laid for generations of saints in succession to arise. "The hand of the Lord will be with us in all our ways: his consolations shall abide in us, we shall be delivered from the tempter, and cleansed by the blood of the Lamb. We shall learn to die to this world, which is daily passing from us. We shall "crucify our flesh with its vices and concupiscence," (*Gal.* v. 24,) and being buried together with our Lord, we shall rise with him and walk in the newness of life. So that henceforth we may sojourn upon this earth as citizens of heaven.

May the blessing of our holy God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, enable us to attain this glorious object, is the prayer of, beloved brethren.

Yours, affectionately, in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, Feb. 19th, 1841.

PASTORAL LETTER FOR EASTER, 1831

John England, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston.

To the Roman Catholic clergy and laity of the Diocess of Charleston, health and blessing.

Reverend Brethren, and beloved Children in Christ:—Whensoever we feel ourselves compelled by circumstances to any relaxation of that

wholesome discipline which preserves the health and vigour of the church, we owe it to ourselves, to you, and to the cause of religion, to exhibit to you plainly the grounds upon which we have swerved from enforcing the general law; so that, being satisfied of their reasonableness, you may not be scandalized, by imagining that what necessity demanded, had been lightly conceded; or that we were unmindful of our heavy responsibility to execute and to enforce, as far as was in our power, those enactments which the prudence and the piety of our predecessors had transmitted to us. No! our ardent desire is to conform, as far as we are able, to that glorious model which the early ages of our church presented to an admiring world,—to use our best exertions to cover the incorruptible ark of our faith with the pure gold of the most perfect Christian virtues; so that, resting under the shadow of heavenly protection, it may be not only to us the pledge of safety, but that the voice of God himself might thence be heard, resolving the doubts of the sincere inquirer after truth, and directing the wanderers through this desert world to the eternal land of promise.

One of the most important injunctions of our blessed Redeemer was that of receiving the sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. "Except you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you." (*John* vi. 54.) And as "whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (I *Cor.* xi. 27), the Apostle admonishes us to prove ourselves previously; which probation has always been exercised, by the examination of the conscience for the discovery of sin; so that if we should be, unfortunately, in that state, we might have recourse to the sacrament of penance,—that, through the aid of the ministry established by Christ in the new law, we might obtain remission, upon confession and repentance. (*John* xx. 21, 22, 23.)

Filled with the fire of that sacred Spirit that descended upon the day of Pentecost (*Acts* ii. 3, 4), to enlighten and to invigorate them in his service, our first predecessors in the faith "persevered in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communion of the breaking of bread, and in prayers." (*Acts* ii. 42), "continuing daily in the temple with one accord." (*Acts* ii. 46.) The habit of daily communion was one of the great characteristics of the first members of the church. How is the soul filled with affecting sentiments; how is piety excited and made tender at the contemplation of these touching scenes, which exhibit the noble simplicity of those sanctified souls, who, despising the allurements of earth, are now crowned with glory? (*Acts* ii. 47.) Alas!

what a contrast presents itself to our view when we place by their sides those who have succeeded to their belief!

We find in the writings of St. Justin the martyr (*Apol.* 2), in the Apostolical Constitutions (lib. viii. c. 20), and in other documents of the first age, that this holy fervour continued through that period to glow in the breasts of the faithful. Even in the beginning of the fifth century St. Jerome informs us (Ep. 5 to Pammachius), that it was then customary, at Rome, for the faithful to receive the body of Christ when they attended at the divine mysteries. St. Augustine informs us (Ep. 52), that in Africa the practice was not uniform.

The wordly spirit which gradually insinuated itself amongst the faithful, after the ravages of the Arian, the Macedonian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, and other early heresies, cooled the warmth of that admirable devotion to the holy sacraments; the ravages of war, and the desolation and disorders brought by barbarous invaders upon the fairest provinces of the church, caused still greater relaxation; and in the year 506, we find a striking testimony thereof in the proceedings of a council of the prelates of Gaul, assembled at the town of Agde, in Languedoc, under the presidency of St. Cæsarius, Bishop of Arles, with the permission of Alaric the Goth. Their 18th canon enacts, that such of the laity as do not go to the holy communion thrice in the year should be excommunicated. "Those laics who shall not have made their communion at the nativity of our Lord, at Easter, and at Pentecost, are not to be considered as Catholics, nor to be accounted amongst Catholics." This was, at that period, considered a serious departure from the excellent discipline of the early days, and from primitive piety. We can, however, discover no part of Christendom which, in those times, sanctioned a longer absence from those divine institutions. In the year 813, under the reign of Charlemagne, the third, provincial Council of Tours, in Gaul, was held; in the 50th canon we read, "Let the laity, if not more frequently, go to the holy communion at least thrice in the year, unless they be prevented by reason of some very great crimes." You will observe that this is not adduced as evidence of any extraordinary relaxation of that century, nor of any peculiar piety of the special church, or of that particular period, but as exhibiting the usual and common state of discipline at that epoch.

These councils were not general, but provincial, their canons are not rules by which the discipline of the whole church was regulated; but they are adduced to show, from special instances, what was the general tenor of the law founded upon the universal practice of the time.

In order more clearly to understand all the legal provisions of the subsequent general councils by which our present discipline upon this subject is regulated, it might not be amiss to remind you, that at the period when Christians were in the habit of daily, or almost daily communion, they must have lived in that state of watchfulness which seldom permitted the triumph of temptation, and they were so fully enriched by the copious grace which they habitually received, that they were powerful antagonists to the enemy of our souls. They did not need the sacrament of penance, though they frequently had recourse thereto. They lived like those who, even in our degenerate days, imitating their example, refresh themselves frequently in the course of the week with this heavenly manna of the Eucharist. They receive the holy communion much more frequently than they go to confession: and when they do confess, their contrition is great, though their transgressions are neither numerous nor heavy. They who sinned mortally in those happy days were few: the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified amongst them, and when the believer had sinned, he came to the Apostle (*Acts* xix. 18,) or to the associate or successor of the Apostle, confessing and declaring his deeds: because he knew that it was to them God had given the ministry of reconciliation, (II *Cor.* v. 18,) and he knew that if we confess our sins he is faithful and just, to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all iniquity, (I *John* i. 9.) Hence, though because of the piety of the faithful the greater number then did, as far as the smaller number do now, amongst us, go frequently to communion, and found it not necessary to go so frequently to confession; yet we find the bishops, who principally attended to the administration of the sacrament of penance, much occupied therewith, —and St. Clement, a companion of St. Paul, and a successor of St. Peter, calling upon sinners to be converted, informs them that "after we shall have departed from this world, we can neither confess nor do penance." (*Ep.* ii. n. 8.) But of course this confession to which he invites the penitents, was to be accompanied with true sorrow and amendment: and in the second century, St. Irenæus, a disciple of the beloved Apostle, whilst he mentions the confessions of some women who had permitted themselves to be corrupted by the heretic Mark, (*Advers. Hæres.* l. i. c. 6,) complains of Cerdon, who, came frequently to confession and as frequently relapsed, (l. iii. c. 4.) Tertullian reproves the foolish criminality of those who, in confession, conceal their sins from men as if they could thus hide them from God, (*De Pœnit.* c. 8, and so forth.) In showing it to be a necessary part of penance he agrees with Origen, who states that the manner in which the sinner

should seek for reconciliation and grace from God, is to declare his sins to the priest of the Lord, (Hom. ii. in *Lev.* n. 4; Hom. 2, in *Psalm.* xxxvii. v. 19.) The fifth Council of Cartage held in 390, in its 3d and 4th canons, regulates, that the priests shall receive the confessions only in the absence of the bishop. But the same causes which produced the neglect of frequent communion, rendered the administration of the sacrament of penance more laborious, and hence the aid of the priests was more frequently required by the bishops, for the accommodation of the penitents. Previous to this, the celebrated Council of Laodicea, in Asia Minor, had in its second canon testified the manner in which the sacrament of penance should be administered, without distinguishing whether its minister was a bishop or a priest. And gradually the relaxation of discipline after the severity of the early penitential canons was disused, produced the custom of applying for confession more frequently to priests, and even to those who were not immediately charged with the care of the individual applying.

For the purpose theretofore of remedying several evils; the fourth Council of Lateran, held in the pontificate of Innocent III., in the year 1215, enacted its twenty-first canon. 1. The faithful had grown exceedingly remiss in approaching the holy communion, and there existed but little hope of inducing them to observe the law which required them to receive the holy eucharist at least thrice in the year: they were therefore required, as of obligation, only to go once, and the festival of Easter was appointed.—2. Great numbers absented themselves from the sacrament of penance for very long periods, several scarcely ever availed themselves of its advantages: it was regulated that each one of the faithful who had arrived at the years of discretion, should go thereto at least once a year. 3. It was alleged frequently, that this application for the sacraments might be made to any approved priest, and when the clergyman charged with the care of souls inquired of those under his charge, they might, in order to avoid what they considered his importunity, allege that they would apply to another: it was enacted, as a remedy, that the Easter duty was to be performed only with that clergyman, who was specially charged with the care of the parish or community to which the individual belonged, except upon some reasonable ground he had consented to allow some members of his flock to use the ministry of other approved priests. 4. The canon enters somewhat into the description of the manner in which this duty should be discharged; as did the sixth general council held at Constantinople, in its canon cii., about 540 years before; the Council of Laodicea, to which we have before adverted, and the acts of which

have been universally adopted by the church; the first council of Chalons upon-the-Soane, in France, held in the sixth year of the reign of Clovis II., about the year 650, canon viii.; as also the xxxii. canon of the subsequent provincial council held in the same place in the reign of Charlemagne, in the year 813; as well as several others.

This canon xxi. of the fourth Council of Lateran, then took away the obligation which, by the former legislation, required communion thrice in the year, and confined it to Easter only. The divine law required that the person who was conscious of mortal sin should have recourse to the sacrament of penance, before receiving the holy eucharist: and the great bulk of the communicants, for ages previous to this council, were persons whose negligence formed so striking a contrast to the fervid piety of the first Christians; they were in the habit of recurring to the tribunal of confession to prepare for communion, and the time now specified for the one was fixed for the other: but there was a salutary restraint placed upon that freedom of choice that confounded the relations between the pastor and his flock, and which deprived the former of the means of knowing those who complied with their duty; and of the opportunity of admonishing the negligent. 5. The canon also enacted, that they who did not comply with its provisions ought to be excluded from Christian communion, and even from entrance to the church whilst living, and, after death, should not be entitled to the rites of Christian sepulture. The Council of Constance, 1414, (Sess. viii.,) and the Council of Trent in its fourteenth session, on the 25th of November, 1551, (Can. v. de Confess.,) have recognised the wisdom and excellence of these enactments. This latter assembly in its thirteenth session, held on the 11th of October, 1551, declares, (Can. ix.) That any person who shall deny that every one of the faithful of either sex, who has arrived at the years of discretion, is bound, by the ecclesiastical precept, to go to communion at least at Easter in every year, errs in his faith.

The period comprised in the phrase at Easter, has been always understood to mean the fifteen days beginning with Palm Sunday, and ending with Low Sunday, as is mentioned by Pope Eugenius IV. in his bull *Fide digna*. Yet it has been generally understood, as was answered by the sacred congregation for explaining the meaning of the canons and so forth of the council, in a decision of November 19th, 1616, that the canon of the Council of Lateran itself, gave to the ordinaries the power, upon reasonable grounds, of dispensing so far as to protract the time for those who could not immediately comply with the obligation.

The peculiar state of the missions in this province rendered it extremely difficult for some, and altogether impossible for others, to comply with the letter of this law; and the pastors found it necessary to extend the period for those who lived at any distance from the missionary stations. Even when the churches became better organized, and the hierarchy was created; the wide extent over which our small flocks were scattered, and the few clergymen that we had to attend them, continued the same inconvenience, and rendered it necessary still to have recourse to the excepting clause of the canon. And though we have been gratified every year by the observance of this law by very great and increasing numbers of our flocks, yet we found that in our present situation, the exact observance of the letter of the law was impossible in this province.

Taking this, amongst other matters, into serious consideration at our provincial council, we resolved, that it would be more becoming to act according to the regular provisions of a law, than continually to have recourse to special exceptions; and that it was more consonant to the sound principles of wholesome discipline, to relax the provisions themselves, to meet the circumstances in which we then were, and were likely to continue, than to have recourse to successive dispensations. We therefore determined to have the legal custom, by which the time was restricted to fifteen days, adapted by a special regulation for our own province. But since this was a general legal custom of ecclesiastical discipline, we were not competent, by our principles of legislation, to make that change permanently, by our own authority: but it was required that the permission should, upon our request, emanate from the chief pastor of the universal church, should he, upon the view of our motives, find them sufficient, and be of opinion that no injury would arise to the general discipline from granting our request. We therefore made the proper application, submitting it in the first instance to the congregation of cardinals, *de propagandâ fide,* that being the proper council to advise the holy father on the subjects of our province. You will perceive by the following decree, which we have received, that he has acceded to our request.

Decree of the Sacred General Congregation, for the Propagation of the Faith, held on the 28*th of June,* 1830.

Whereas, in the sacred general congregation for the propagation of the faith, held on the 28th of June, in the year 1830, there was read the memorial written by the most Reverend and Right Reverend Fathers, the Archbishop of Baltimore, and the Bishops of the United

States of North America, in their provincial council, celebrated in the month of October, 1829, in which they requested our holy father, that because of the scarcity of priests, the distance of stations, and a custom already existing, he would grant for all those diocesses, faculties to extend the time to fulfil the precept of Easter communion from the first Sunday in Lent to Trinity Sunday, both included: that sacred congregation, upon the report of the Most Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinal Peter Caprano, was of opinion and decreed, that His Holiness should be requested to grant the desired favour.

Moreover, the said opinion of the sacred congregation having been reported to our holy father Pius VIII. by divine providence, Pope, by the Right Reverend Castraccius Castracane, secretary of the said congregation; His Holiness, at an audience on the 26th day of September, 1830, kindly approved thereof, and granted the requested faculties.

Given at Rome, at the house of the aforesaid congregation, on the 16th day of October, 1830.

[Seal] D. Maurus. Card. Cappellari,
Pref. Cong. P. F.

C. Castracane, *Secretary.*

Availing ourselves therefore of the conceded faculties; we announce to you, that we have for the present, and until notice to the contrary shall have been given, extended, and do by these presents extend the legal time for complying with the Easter duty in the diocess of Charleston, from the first Sunday in Lent to Trinity Sunday, both included, in every year: so that for the purpose of complying with the provisions of the xxi. canon of the fourth Council of Lateran, that period shall be considered the Paschal or Easter time.

Thus, the law at present regulates, that the Easter communion may be performed, and the canon of the Council of Lateran complied with, in this diocess, on any day from the first Sunday in Lent to Trinity Sunday, both included. But you will perceive that the grounds of this relaxation are, the peculiar circumstances of our want of a sufficient ministry, and the remoteness of great numbers of our flock, who scattered over the wide surface of extended regions, could not, without very serious inconvenience, come to their duty within the time prescribed. This extension, therefore, should not tend to encourage sloth or negligence in those who have been heretofore indolent; nor to relax the piety of those who have hitherto been regular.

We have indeed given praise to God, and been ourselves edified by occasion of the yearly increase in the number of our flock who have

complied with the provisions of this most salutary law. And at the present festival we have had more abundant consolation in this regard. Yet, beloved, however small is the number of those who have observed the precept, when compared with those who are still deaf, not only to our admonitions, but to the injunction of the spouse of our blessed Redeemer, and to the voice of that Saviour himself! We do intreat you therefore, in every place, to enter fully into the sentiments of true religion and genuine piety respecting this important duty. Emulate the zeal and the perfection of those first Christians of whose faith you are the inheritors. Do not, by reason of this extension of the time for the performance of these great acts of Christian virtue, lose that devotion which you have entertained for this great festival on which we commemorate the resurrection of our Lord.

To our brethren of the clergy we address our admonition and request, that they would, with renewed zeal, devote themselves to the exhortation of the faithful and the affording them more ample opportunities. Upon our beloved children of the laity, we would urge the necessity of turning those opportunities to account, so that enriched by the graces of the sacraments, they may be able to triumph over the obstacles by which they are opposed in the way to heaven, and profiting by the graces of the Redeemer, they may secure the crown of immortal glory, the rich inheritance to which they are invited by the mercy of their God.

We also desire that this our pastoral letter be read to every congregation in our diocess, by the priest thereof, the first Sunday after he shall have received the same, and met the congregation.

Grace be to you and peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost.

Given at Charleston, on this fifth day of April in the year of our Lord, 1831.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By order of the Bishop,

PETER WHELAN, *Secretary.*

PASTORAL LETTER FOR EASTER, 1838

John England, by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston, and so forth.

To his beloved flock the clergy and laity of the said diocess—health and blessing.

Beloved Brethren:—We have already entered upon the holy time

of Lent, and are approaching the solemnities of the holy week. These will be followed by the great festival of Easter; and then succeeds the observance of the Paschal time, before whose termination we commemorate the ascension of our blessed Lord; the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the establishment of the Christian church, by the completion of the apostolic power, the presence of the guiding spirit of truth, the entering of multitudes into the fold of the good shepherd, and the observance of the new commandment, in the manifestation of that charity which surpasseth all understanding. This is then indeed an acceptable time; these are days of salvation; for now prayer is multiplied, instruction is spread forth, oblation is made, sins are bewailed, the works of darkness are abandoned, alms are bestowed, a fast is proclaimed; the priests weep between the porch and the altar and call upon the Lord, through the merits of the Saviour, to have compassion and to spare; to look upon the face of his Christ and not upon the sins of his people:—because we have all strayed from the path of duty, we have deserted the way of obedience, we have squandered the holy inheritance of divine grace, we have served our passions; we feel the degradation, and we avow that we are no longer worthy to be called his children. In these days of penance and of mortification, through the whole earth, our brethren in the faith endeavour to redeem the time they have misspent, they offer a holy violence to heaven, and clothing themselves and their altars in penitential vesture, they seek by the external admonition to excite the soul to stronger conviction of the necessity of repentance and to greater efforts for insuring reconciliation. The sacraments are more generally frequented; so that Christians withdrawing from the cares, the distractions and the allurements of the world, enter seriously into themselves, diligently consider the end of their creation, the purpose of their redemption, the evanescence of the world, the fleeting nature of time, the duration of eternity, the value of their souls, the importance of religion, and the dignity and unspeakable benefit of the institutions of our blessed Saviour; and numbers by the divine aid are turned from the ways of iniquity and enter upon the paths of justice.

Shall we then, beloved brethen, in the midst of such occasions and incitements, suffer this holy time to pass unprofitably away? Shall we continue to be insensible to the advantages that we may obtain, by duly exerting ourselves in this time of religious observance? We have hitherto been over-negligent—we have suffered many opportunities to pass away unheeded, or if we made efforts, they were weak, transitory, and imperfect. We were like those persons whom St. Augustine

describes, as desirous to leave their couch, from a conviction that it was their duty; yet, so overpowered by sloth, that half rising, they again lie down: they say, but for a very little time—they slumber—they again become conscious—they reproach themselves for their weakness, and yet remain for, as they say, a little time longer. We have, like them, too long put off our conversion to the pastor of our souls, through a criminal procrastination. We have frequently said—"after a little time." Why shall we not ask ourselves, as St. Augustine did? Why not to-day? Why not now? Why defer that which we feel should be done? The Church addresses to us those words of the Apostle, which, by the blessing of God, were made so efficacious to that holy doctor in the hour of his struggle—"And knowing the time; that it is now the hour for us to rise from sleep: for our salvation is nearer than when we first believed. The night is passed, and the day is at hand. Let us, therefore, cast off the works of darkness, and put on the armour of light." (*Rom.* xiii.)

We have, my brethren, not been sufficiently awake to the necessity of using those means which God has appointed, to enable us to be fully restored to his favour, to serve him with due fidelity and to insure to ourselves his protection. It is time that we should shake off this torpor, that we should be aroused from this lethargy, that we should arise and look around and be enlightened, and use exertion to secure our eternal inheritance—for, beloved, what will it profit a man to gain the whole world and to lose his own soul?

It is for this purpose that, from an overwhelming sense of duty, I now call upon you, because, unworthy as I am, placed as a watchman to look out for the approach of the enemy and to give notice of the approach of danger, to rouse to exertion and to point out where the assault is to be repelled. And to perform this duty, it is frequently necessary to call upon you, to exhort you, to be instant in season, out of season, to reprove, to intreat, to rebuke with all patience and doctrine, to be vigilant, to fulfil the obligation of the ministry, as being to render an account of you to that same Lord Jesus Christ who has redeemed you with his blood.

In order then, to save ourselves from the wrath to come, in the bowels of charity, it is obligatory, to warn you of your negligence and to urge you to exertion. Beloved brethren, the Apostle St. Paul, admonishing his disciple Timothy, informed him (I *Tim.* iii.) "that in the last days shall come dangerous times: men shall be lovers of themselves, covetous, haughty, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, ungrateful, wicked, without affection, without peace, slanderers, incontinent,

unmerciful, without kindness, traitors, stubborn, puffed up, and lovers of pleasure more than of God: having an appearance, indeed, of piety, but denying the power thereof"—and he warned his disciple "Now these avoid."

The picture here drawn, is indeed an afflicting exhibition of the frailty and of the degradation of our state: yet, is it—and the question is put with a melancholy feeling of what the answer should be—is it one whose features may not be discovered amongst ourselves? Is not the love of gain, the total absolute devotion to the acquisition of wealth, the characteristic of our day? Do not men count every other pursuit to be a perfect loss of time? Is not the mind occupied, is not the body engaged in this absorbing employment? And, unfortunately, we witness, too manifestly, the exemplification of that other statement of the Apostle, (I *Tim.* vi.) "For they who would become rich fall into temptation, and into the snare of the devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For covetousness is the root of all evil; which some desiring, have erred from the faith, and have entangled themselves with many sorrows."

This prevailing sin of our day, creates in those who are successful, pride, self-sufficiency, stubbornness, ambition, love of pleasure, and a disregard of religion. In those who are disappointed, it produces discontent, envy, slander, recklessness, and a desertion of religious practices. It is hard to say whether the temptation to deceit, fraud and circumvention, be stronger for the prosperous or for the disappointed! This passion leaves no day of rest for its slave. To conform to custom, to avoid outraging public decency, to stand well in the estimation of the world, the open prosecution of business is abandoned on the Lord's day; but you will find its votary within his recess, as deeply occupied with his books and his accounts, as on the ordinary days of the week. You will find the store of the dealer closed, but there is access by a private way, and the occupant is immersed in the ordinary pursuit of profit. Hence, if you look around on the attendants in the temple of the Lord, you will perceive that a large portion of the heads of families are absent—and their explanation is, that their business will not permit their attendance!—What can be expected from the members of the household, when their head has been thus criminally negligent?—Yet these persons flatter themselves that they are religious, or that at least they are not enemies of religion, because they do not perpetrate murder, nor commit other enormous crimes, for which they would have to answer at the bar of a court of justice, or be driven from the midst of society!

There is a most mischievous principle which pervades the minds of numbers, and which united to the above pernicious and widespread maxims and practices, causes the ruin of our youth. It is the principle, that for the purpose of preserving our liberties, their sons must be educated with a spirit of independence. The mistake is equally fatal in politics as it is in religion. The safety of a republic is only to be found in the virtue of its citizens. The sacred writ, the testimony of sages, as well of the Gentile, the Jew, and the Christian lands; the experience of the world, all prove, that nothing is more destructive to virtue than the licentiousness of youth:—and by the expression, licentiousness, it is meant to convey the notion of an absence of wholesome and effectual restraint. This begets disobedience, arrogance, pride, self-sufficiency, or what the Apostle calls being puffed up: it destroys affection and creates ingratitude. Far be it from me, beloved brethren, to insinuate that which I do not believe, that your children have naturally a less affectionate disposition, or worse moral qualities than others. On the contrary, if a distinction is to be drawn, I believe it would rather result in their favour; and, therefore, the parents are the less excusable for the gross neglect of their moral and religious culture.

In the faithful discharge of the task which we have undertaken, we are therefore bound to say, that great neglect of religious duty is to be found amongst us, and attributable mainly, as I believe, to an inordinate affection for the things of this world, to an inordinate esteem of ourselves, and to a great neglect of the proper education of our youth. And to correct these faults, we exhort and we entreat you to turn the present opportunity to account, by having recourse to God, in the sincerity of your hearts, to obtain from him that wisdom which will enable us to discover the source of those evils that we deplore, and that strength which will enable us to correct them.

We beseech you then, beloved brethren, through your desire of salvation, as you hope for the mercy of your Saviour, by your love for religion, and through the charity of Christ Jesus, to enter now seriously upon the due observance of this holy time, and to devote, in an especial manner, some days to the great concern of eternity, to the contemplation of what your Redeemer has done to aid you, and to endeavour to correspond with his grace, by having recourse to those means which he has placed within your reach.

We particularly invite you in this holy season to a diligent examination of your conscience, a comparison of your conduct with the law of the Saviour by which you will be judged, and by whose provisions your eternal doom is to be decided. This law must be studied, not for

the purpose of endeavouring to find how its letter may seem to be observed whilst its spirit would be abandoned; but for the purpose of learning, how you may be filled with the knowledge which would make you wise unto salvation, by leading you to imbibe the spirit of the Gospel, and to show forth its influence by your actions. But this should only be an appropriate preparation for the sacrament of penance, which too many have too long neglected. Led away by the influence of bad example; yielding to that reluctance to renounce good practices, which is a consequence of even their slight neglect; habituated to procrastination; engaged in pursuits which it was necessary to abandon if you would be reconciled to Heaven, but to which your attachment increased with indulgence; the remorse which you once felt having been checked by the sophistry of self-love, or stifled by the determination to assert for yourselves perfect freedom to sin; filled with the spirit of the world, with the love of its pleasures, with an esteem for its idols, with a desire for its regard; and weakly yielding to a false shame, by which you felt as if degraded by the performance of religious duty; years have passed away since you have applied this salutary remedy to the wounds of your soul. How have they festered and rankled and become infectious to your moral system?

We entreat you then, in this holy time, to seek once more, by this efficacious sacrament of the Saviour for health and reconciliation!—"If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the just: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but for those of the whole world," I *John* ii. 1, 2.) "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity," *(Ibid.* i, 8, 9.) "For this purpose he has established in his church, the ministry of reconciliation," (II *Cor.* 18, 19, 20,) so that the truly penitent sinner may have recourse to that tribunal which he appointed. (*John* xx. 21, 22, 23): "And he said to them again: Peace be unto you; as the Father hath sent me, so I send you. When he said this, he breathed on them: and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven to them: whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." Return therefore to him with confidence, and be consoled and strengthened by what the Lord declares through his phophet Ezekiel (xviii. 21, and so forth): "But if the wicked do penance for all his sins which he hath committed, and keep all my commandments, and do judgment and justice, living he shall live, and shall not die. I will not remember all his iniquities, that he hath done; in his justice which he hath

wrought he shall live. Is it my will that a sinner should die, saith the Lord God, and not that he should be converted from his ways and live?" Have recourse then, by true repentance, to his mercy. "Be converted, and do penance for all your iniquities, and iniquity will not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions, by which you have transgressed; and make yourselves a new heart and a new spirit; and why will you die, O house of Israel? For I desire not the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; return ye and live." Hear what the beloved disciple addresses to us—(I *John* ii. 16, and so forth.) "Love not the world, nor those things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the charity of the Father is not in him; for all that is in the world, is the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life; which is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away and the concupiscence thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." Be then no longer seduced by the false maxims, by the specious allurements, by the deceitful promises or the empty vanity which have caused so much destruction to yourselves and to your children. Return to that Spirit which gave you more consolation and sweet peace, and which will secure to you a more glorious inheritance.

Reconciled by the sacrament of penance in virtue of the blood of your Saviour, in which through love for you, he washes away your sins, (*Apoc.* i. 5,) you will be qualified to stand in the midst of those whom the Lamb will lead to the fountains of the waters of life, and from whose eyes God shall wipe away every tear, (*Apoc.* vii. 17.) You will have a right to the tree of life; and may enter in by the gates into the city of the New Jerusalem, (*Apoc.* xxii. 14,) into which nothing defiled can be admitted, (xxi. 27.) You may then approach to eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and to drink his blood, that he may abide in you, and you in him.

This is the victim with which you are regaled by the true Melchisedec, upon your triumphant return from the defeat of those predatory kings who enjoyed a transient victory, and held captive for a short time the friends of God. (*Gen.* xiv. 18.) This is the true manna, and the refreshing stream by which the spiritual Israelites are sustained in their way to the land of promise. (*Exod.* xvi. 15; xvii. 6.) This is indeed the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world, by whose blood we are saved, (*Exod.* xiii. 13,) and whose flesh is our sustenance, (*Exod.* xii. 8; John vi. 56.) It is the bread of life and of the Lord mystically typified by the loaves of proposition, (*Exod.* xi. 21,) for the offering and the partaking of which sanctity is required, (*Levit.* xxi. 6, 8; I *Kings* xxi.,) and the invigorating effect of which is also

exhibited in that unleavened and mysterious cake which sustained the Thesbite prophet in his journey to the mount of God. (III *Kings* xix 8.) It is to this bread of angels that you are invited in this holy time. This the sensual man perceiveth not, for it is foolishness to him and he cannot understand, but it is intelligible to you who are in Christ Jesus, who is made to us wisdom from God, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption. (I *Cor.* i. 30; ii. 14.) That you may therefore be worthy guests at this banquet, we then admonish you, "Purge out the old leaven of iniquity, that you may be a new mass" in the holiness of renovated justice and grace, "for Christ our pasch is sacrificed," (I *Cor.* v. 7,) and you are invited to partake of the flesh of this saving victim.

Anxious for your perfection on earth and for your glory in heaven, with tender solicitude and maternal authority, the church now commands you to approach to the holy communion. Will you then be regardless of the invitation of your Saviour, and of the solemn injunction of his holy spouse, that mother to whose guardianship he has entrusted you? No! beloved children; we expect better things from you than perverse and continued negligence; though you have been for a time unmindful of your duty, we expect the consolation of beholding your return.

And in order to encourage you thereto, we have determined to use the power entrusted to us, as an additional inducement to your acceptance of the invitation that is given.

We are authorized by a special power from the holy father to grant, four times in the year, a plenary indulgence, for sufficient cause. And we do consider the encouragement of our beloved flock to the perfect return, by repentance and the sacraments, to a reconciliation with their offended Creator, to be a most fitting motive for thus slaying the fatted calf, and spreading forth this spiritual feast.

We have, therefore, determined to establish a course of spiritual exercises, to be observed in the several churches of this diocess, during one week in each, at such time as may be determined upon by its pastor, with our consent.

On this occasion there shall be a course of instruction and suitable prayers, once or oftener each day, as may be determined upon.

Full opportunity shall be also afforded, during that week, to each person, to approach the holy sacraments of penance and the holy eucharist.

A plenary indulgence is hereby given, by the aforesaid authority, to every one of the faithful who, truly repenting of sin, shall receive

the holy sacraments of penance and the eucharist, and shall attend four times at the said religious exercises and instructions, and shall say the usual prayers for the conversion of sinners, the increase of faith and the peace and prosperity of the church.

Where there are congregations or individuals at too great a distance from any church, they may obtain the same indulgence by receiving the sacraments and offering the prayers, and reading such works of instruction, or exercises of devotion, as may be pointed out by the clergyman from whom they receive the sacraments.

This pastoral letter will be read for each congregation by its pastor, as soon as possible, after its receipt.

The first week of the exercises will commence on Sunday, the 25th instant, in the Church of St. Mary, Hassell Street, in this city.

The second week will commence on Sunday the 1st of April, in the Cathedral Church of St. Finbar.

And now, brethren, may the God of all peace and consolation strengthen us, and confirm us in his service through the merits of our blessed Redeemer Jesus Christ, to whom with the Father and the Holy Ghost be honour and glory for ever. Amen.

Given at Charleston, this 20th day of March, in the year of our Lord 1838.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

APPENDIX TO PASTORAL LETTERS FOR EASTER

LETTERS OF "CURIOSITY" ON THE TIME OF CELEBRATING EASTER; WITH A REPLY TO THE SAME.

[The following appeared in Nos. 2, 4, and 5, of the *United States Catholic Miscellany,* Vol. I.]

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 7th, 1822.

To the Reverend Frederick Dalcho, M. D., Assistant Minister of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, and so forth.

Reverend Sir:—Being of an inquiring disposition, and wishing to obtain accurate information of facts, as well as to know the authority upon which they rest, I address myself to you.

You have published 612 pages of a *History of the Protestant Episcopal Church of South Carolina,* besides other works, which prove you to be deeply read in church history. I find in your work above mentioned, the following passage:

Page 407. "In the second century, a warm dispute had existed

between the Greek and Latin Churches, whether Easter day should be celebrated on the 14th or the 15th day of the Pascal moon. The Church of Rome adopted the 15th, and the Greek Church the 14th, according to primitive usage. This question was again revived in the sixth century, and the British churches adopted the 14th day, after the example of the Greek Church."

Will you, sir, have the goodness to inform me—first, upon what authority you state the difference as to celebrating Easter, between the Greek and Latin Churches, in the second century, to have been whether it should be celebrated on the 14th or the 15th day of the Pascal moon: secondly, that the Church of Rome adopted the 15th; thirdly, that the primitive usage was to celebrate it upon the 14th; and, fourthly, that the British churches adopted the 14th, after the example of the Greek Church, in the sixth century?

Your compliance will oblige me, and greatly add to the stock of information possessed by, reverend sir,

Your obedient, humble servant,

CURIOSITY.

CHARLESTON, S. C., June 21, 1822.

To the Editor of the Catholic Miscellany.

Sir:—The Reverend Doctor Dalcho not having vouchsafed to satisfy me, upon the queries proposed by me in your second number, may I request you will have the goodness to inform me whether the reverend and learned historian of the Protestant Episcopal Church of South Carolina stated the facts correctly, in his passage concerning the celebration of Easter quoted by me, and inserted by you?

One of the benefits I enjoy, by not giving my name, is that I sometimes hear myself spoken of pretty freely. The other evening, at a tea-chat, I heard a young lady say, it was a great shame to print Doctor Dalcho's name in the Catholic newspaper. If any person had curiosity to ask questions, they might be asked of the author of the history, or some such way, without mentioning names. Another said, she saw no right any person had to ask such questions; if one did not like the book, he need not read it. I wish to have your opinion of these observations, as I should like to ask a few more questions upon the eighth chapter of the aforesaid history.

I am, sir, your constant reader,

CURIOSITY.

In answer to our inquisitive correspondent, we state that he did not, as far as we know, desire the Reverend Doctor Dalcho to print his

name in the title-page of his book—the Doctor did it—the Doctor must take the consequences. Did he publish a work without affixing his name thereto, it would, generally speaking, be rude and uncivil to call upon him by name, and the observation of the lady would have been correct; but, however ungallant it may appear, we must, in the present case, differ from her, and decide that our friend "Curiosity" has not acted incorrectly.

As to the remark of the other person; whether by lady or gentleman we are not informed; it cannot, for a moment, be sustained. An historian writes for the public; the public—every individual of that public—has a right to canvass the facts, and to call for the authority if he doubts the correctness of the statement; and especially when the writer, as in the present case, labours very hard to prove that a new religion was an old one, and an old religion a new one. Provided the queries be made in a respectful and polite way, without anything offensive in the matter or manner, we should like to have them continued; and as the object of the reverend Doctor is the discovery of truth, which, of course, together with placing it on record when discovered, is the object of every good historian, we have no doubt he will himself be pleased by the assistance which he may thus receive to rectify some trifling mistakes, which would make his succeeding editions more accurate.

The reverend historian's book has fallen into our hands, and it contains much truth, though as no human work is perfect, we think there are some mistakes, but they are principally contained in one chapter; and that, too, which makes them of the less moment, treats of events which took place three or four hundred years ago—some of them twelve or fourteen hundred, and some of them even farther back. We are convinced the historian did his best, and ought, therefore, to be held blameless, though he might be assisted. And really, upon the whole, when one comes to balance the accuracy of the detail of proceedings in council, not of bishops, but of lay gentlemen, of commissioners, and the origin of vestries, the several good gentlemen who laboured at Goose Creek and James Island, and white schools and black schools, and acts of the state legislature, which are all given, we suppose, with the most scrupulous exactness, it is a matter of little moment what way Easter was regulated some hundreds of years ago.

But as our friend "Curiosity" has thrown the explanation upon us, we must do the best we can.

We had better give a short history of the difference which really did exist. We shall refer but briefly to very few out of very many authorities.

The Christian Easter succeeded to the Jewish Passover. (St. August. *Ep.* 119.)

The Jewish Passover was at first always celebrated after the vernal-equinox, latterly, before or after, indifferently. (*Exod.* xii. Josephus, *Antiq.* b. iii. c. 13.)

At the commencement of the church, the Apostles made no special law for the particular time of the celebration. (*Soc.* lib. v. c. 21, *alias* 22.)

But in the days of the Apostles a uniform custom prevailed in most churches, and this uniform custom diffused itself together with the doctrine, except in Ephesus and some of the churches of Asia Minor. (*Acts of the 1st Council of Nice*; Epistle of Polycrates in *Euseb* b. v. c. 22 or 25.)

The general custom was to celebrate it on the Sunday after the 14th day of the moon of the vernal equinox, provided that the 14th day of the moon did not precede the equinox.

A. D. 199. At the same time, considerable disputes took place "because the churches of Asia, from an ancient tradition, thought proper to observe the feast of Easter on the 14th of the moon, on which day the Jews were commanded to offer their paschal lamb. So that upon whatever day of the week that day of the moon fell, the fasting days ended. Whereas, the other churches throughout the world were accustomed not to celebrate Easter after this manner, but observed the Apostolic custom and tradition as yet retained, viz., that the fasting days should not terminate before that day whereon our Saviour rose from death to life. Wherefore, synods and meetings of bishops were summoned, in which all, with one accord, ordained an ecclesiastical decree, which they published by their epistles to all churches, that upon no other day but the Sunday should the mystery of the Saviour's resurrection be celebrated, and that on that day, and no other, the fasting used before Easter should end. The epistle of those who assembled in Palestine, at that time, for this purpose, is still extant, of whom Theophilus, Bishop of Cæsarea, and Narcissus, Bishop of Jerusalem, were the principal. At Rome likewise, a synod was held for the same purpose, the result of which the Bishop Victor published. Again, there was another one of bishops, at Pontus, where Palmas presided as the eldest. Another, of bishops of France, under Irenæus. To be brief, there was another of bishops throughout Ostrœna and the cities thereof, and particularly of Banchilius, Bishop of Corinth, with many others, all which, with one and the same sentence and judgment, ordained the

same decree, and their uniform assent was thus made manifest to the world." (*Eusebius,* b. v. c. 21, *alias* Gr. 23.)

'Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, writes to Pope Victor: "I could repeat the bishops which were present, and whom you requested of me to assemble, whom also I have assembled together."

' "All these celebrated the feast of Easter, according unto the Gospel, upon the 14th day of the moon." "I therefore have conferred with the brethren throughout the world, have read and re-read the Holy Scriptures, and will not be moved." ' (*Eusebius,* b. v. c. 22, *alias* Gr. 25.)

'Narcissus, Theophilus, Cassius, Bishop of Tyre, Clarus, Bishop of Ptolemais, and the others, published their decision, to which they add: "We signify to you that at Alexandria they celebrate Easter upon the selfsame day with us. Their epistles are brought to us, and ours to them, that we may uniformly and together celebrate this feast, *i. e.,* upon the Sunday, not upon the 14th of the moon." ' (Ch. 24. *alias* Gr. 27.)

Tertullian mentions a man named Blastus, who also held this time of celebrating Easter, on the 14th.

From the time of Pope Victor to that of Pope Sylvester, this question was agitated; but in his pontificate the question was put to rest by a decision in the first Council of Nice, in the year 325.

"There was, moreover, no small contention, and a great tumult among the vulgar sort; before which there was also another pestilent kind of sedition scattered abroad into particular provinces, which greatly disturbed the quiet of the church, to wit, the schism about the time of the celebration of the feast of Easter, which then had only possessed the eastern parts, whilst some curiously observed the Judaical celebration of the feast, some others the general custom and manner of Christians throughout the world." (From Lib. i. *Socrates,* c. v. Gr. viii.)

Concerning the decision of the council he writes: "So that not only there flourished amongst them one faith, but also they agreed altogether to celebrate the solemn feast of Easter at one and the same time throughout the world. Now, therefore, the canons concluded upon by the common consent of all, were ratified by the subscription of every one, and recorded for posterity."

The following is an extract of the letter sent by the bishop of this council to the people of Alexandria, and exhibits their decision.

"We send you glad tidings of the uniform consent and agreement touching the celebration of the most sacred feast of Easter, that by means of your prayers the stir raised in that behalf was quietly

appeased. So that all the brethren inhabiting the East who have heretofore observed the manner of the Jews, now with uniform consent do follow the Romans, and us and you who of old have retained with us the selfsame order and manner of celebration,"—*i. e.* Sunday. From Lib. v. *Socrates,* chap. vi. Gr. ix. *Epistle of Fathers to Alexandria,* and so forth.)

Constantine the Great was son of St. Helena, a British lady, who was from early life a Christian. She knew the time of celebrating Easter in that church. The emperor himself was then a Christian, and knew the customs of that island. The fathers of Nice came from all parts of the Christian Church, and those in and near Britain knew its customs.

The emperor then, in his letter enumerating the churches which celebrated Easter on Sunday, mentions BRITAIN.

We then answer our friend Curiosity.

First, that it was a mistake in the reverend historian to state, that the difference between the Greek and Latin Churches was whether Easter should be celebrated on the 14th or the 15th day of the Paschal moon. For in the first place, the difference was not between the Greek Church and the Latin Church, but between that portion of Asia Minor which was immediately in the vicinity of Ephesus, and the entire of the Christian world with that exception; and the bishops of Greece, of Palestine, and even of that portion of Asia Minor which was attached to Pontus, which were all portions of the Greek Church, celebrated with the Latin Church, as did the churches of Africa; and next, the dispute was as to celebrating it on the 14th, whether before or after the equinox, according to the corrupt Judaic mode, or on the Sunday next after the 14th which followed the equinox.

In the second place, we find the Doctor mistaken in stating that the Church of Rome adopted the 15th, for she adopted no day, but followed what she had always observed; and this was not to celebrate on the 14th, nor on the 15th, but on the Sunday. If this were not the case, the historian would have to do what is impossible,—to show when Rome changed from the 15th to the Sunday, which is her present practice, and the Doctor's own. Where did he receive it? Dear Doctor, you need not travel to Greece; Rome is nearer home.

In the third place, the learned historian mistakes when he states that to celebrate it on the 14th was the primitive usage. We can show him pretty old authority besides what we have already adduced.

The seventh or eighth of the Apostolic Canons prohibits, under

penalty of deposition, any bishop or priest, and so forth, to celebrate Easter before the equinox, lest he should appear to Judaize.

The Jews celebrated on the 14th, and the few churches of Asia Minor observed the same day; and this very old canon forbids this practice; and the celebration upon Sunday is stated by the vast majority of churches to have been the primitive usage.

After the Council of Nice, they who denied the authority of the church to regulate the time for celebration, and who adhered to the 14th day, were considered heretics, and called Quartodecimans. In the celebration they became schismatics; by denying the doctrine of church authority, they became heretics. Surely, then, the reverend historian would not build his British Church upon the foundations of schism and heresy, condemned by the Catholic world at Nice in the year 325, especially where we have particular testimony that Britian, concurred with the rest of the world, against his conjectures that she followed the Asiatic churches.

We have trespassed so far with this subject upon our columns, that we must defer the answer and explanations to the fourth query to our next; and request of our friend Curiosity, if possible, to mitigate his ardour a little, and allow us leisure to lay some more interesting documents before our readers for the present.

We have now to examine, 1st. Was the question concerning Easter, which existed in the second century, revived in the sixth? 2dly. Did the British churches adopt the fourteenth day of the Paschal moon for celebrating Easter? 3dly. Was this done after the example of the Greek Church? For the reverend historian's assertion is properly reduced to these three propositions: 1. The same question which caused the dispute between the Greek and Latin churches, concerning the celebration of Easter, was again revived in the sixth century. By the way, we ask, what is the meaning of the word again? Does the reverend historian mean to insinuate that it had been previously revived, and was now again revived? 2. The British churches adopted the fourteenth day. 3. The British churches did this after the example of the Greek church.

We think it better to clear our way as quickly as possible. We then say the Doctor mistook in this last proposition; for the British church could not adopt the fourteenth, after the example of a church which had never celebrated Easter on the fourteenth. We showed, in our last, that the Greek Church generally celebrated with Rome, but a few churches in Asia celebrated on the fourteenth. The British churches

might have followed their example; but to say they followed the example of the Greek Church, would not be correct. Having rectified this mistake, the third proposition now must be, The British churches did so after the example of a few churches Asia Minor. This we shall examine by and by.

We now state the Doctor to have mistaken in each of the three propositions: so that in the small paragraph making this last assertion, there are four mistakes, which, added to the four exhibited the last day, will make eight; and if this was not a second revival, that is, a third appearance, again will give us a ninth mistake in one short sentence.

The first question for our inquiry is, what was the error of the British churches? The venerable Bede informs us, (*History,* lib iii. c. 25, and lib. v. c. 22), that they differed from the whole world in their time of celebrating Easter. This does not look like following the example of either Greeks or Asiatics; and the Doctor, for he is an historian, knows that Bede was a British priest who lived in the seventh century, and an historian of the British church. We have seen before, that Britain agreed with the whole world, in the fourth century, upon this point; how then did she differ from them in the sixth?

Let us look a little to history; it is troublesome, but it is very useful. A man who wishes to write it well, cannot print six hundred and twelve pages every year.

A few years after the condemnation of the Quartodecimans at Nice, the custom of celebrating on the fourteenth gradually fell into disuse; but in the middle of the fourth century, a heretic named Arius, whom the Doctor must know, denied the use of praying for the dead, the difference between the orders of bishops and priests, and the propriety of at all celebrating Easter. (*Epiphan. Heres.* 75.)

Some good folk in Cappadocia, previous to this, celebrated Easter always on the 25th of March, and made Easter a fixed and not a moveable festival, as well as some of the early Christians in Gaul; the reason for their agreement in the day, we cannot now detain our readers with. The latter stated that it was on the 25th of March our Lord arose from the dead. (*Theop. Cœar. apud. Bed, rat. temp.* c. 45.) The former stated that it was on the 25th of March he was crucified, and that as the Jewish Passover was the day on which the lamb was slain, the Christian Pasch should be the day on which Christ was slain. (*Epiph. Heres.* 50) But unfortunately for both theories, the Dominical letter for the year of the crucifixion proves that the 25th of March

was neither on Friday nor on Sunday in that year, so that both Gauls and Cappadocians were wrong.

The Novatians, shortly after the Arians, held a council at Angaris, in Bithynia, near Helenopolis, and decreed that every church might observe Easter when it saw proper.

These certainly were no revivals of the Quartodeciman error, but specifically different.

The Council of Antioch, which was composed in a great degree of Arians, and principally bishops of Asia Minor, though they were generally opposed to Rome, and pronounced sentence of deposition against St. Athanasius, yet in their first canon excommunicate those who would not conform to the Nicene decree concerning Easter.

But though the rule for the time of celebrating this festival was laid down by the Council of Nice, and the golden number was invented to facilitate the discovery of the precise time, still, in computing it, there was frequent disagreement. We shall state a few examples.

In the beginning of the fifth century, Pope Innocent I. wrote to Aurelius, the Bishop of Carthage, to assemble a synod, in order to regulate the particular time, and to send him information, that he might communicate it to the other churches.

Soon afterwards, in the time of Pope Leo, the same difficulties perpetually occurring, he wrote upon the subject to the Emperor Marcian, to Eudoxia, and to the churches of Gaul and Spain; and at length, as the most famous astronomical school was then at Alexandria, he regulated that it should be the duty of the bishop of that See to ascertain previously the proper time, and to notify it to the Pope, that he might communicate it to the whole church.

But it happened that during this time of uncertainty, many churches were left in ignorance, and to calculate for themselves upon the Nicene rule which they received. Celestine, who was a predecessor of Leo, sent St. Patrick to Ireland; and he possessed the Nicene rule, as did Palladius and others, sent at the same time to Ireland and Scotland. This was in 431 or 432. They always celebrated Easter on Sunday: but by some mistake in the mode of applying the rule, they celebrated on the Sunday nearest or immediately after the thirteenth day of the moon. This Sunday sometimes happened to be the fourteenth, and sometimes not. Bede testifies the fact, as do many records of the old Irish churches; and during the revolutions in England, as Bede and others testify, many of the British clergy were educated in Ireland, in the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries. Thus the Irish mode of computation, which differed from all those that we have previously described,

differed from that of Asia, and differed from the Roman; and thus was Bede perfectly correct, when he stated that the British differed from the whole world; and thus the reverend and learned historian Dalcho mistakes when he asserts that the disputes of the second century were revived in the sixth; and thus does he mistake when he states they were again revived, for they were not revived at all, nor again. And he mistakes when he asserts that the British churches adopted the fourteenth, for they adopted Sunday; and he again mistakes when he asserts this was done after the example of the Greek Church, because the Greek Church did not adopt this mode; and again the Doctor mistakes when he asserts, even by insinuation, that it was done after the custom of the Asiatic churches, for it was not, but through ignorance of the mode of computation adopted.

We will grant the Doctor, that some obstinate men who followed this mode did allege, when they had no other grounds, that Easter was at one time observed differently in the East, after the example of St. John the apostle; but, like other folk, they only showed their obstinacy and their ignorance, for they did not imitate that example: and if they did, would be rejected by the whole church as schismatics and heretics, in place of being as they were, instructed and received into communion.

We entreat of the reverend historian, if our friend Curiosity should continue inquisitive, not to inflict upon us the penance of answering him. We never desired the Doctor to write his history. Had we been near him when he was writing his eight chapter, we would have entreated him not to attempt impossibilities.

PASTORAL LETTER FOR ADVENT, 1837

John England, by the grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston, and so forth.

To our beloved flock, the Clergy and Laity of the Roman Catholic Church in the Diocess of Charleston, health and blessing.

Beloved Brethren:—Amongst other matters of local discipline which were treated of in the third provincial council of Baltimore, celebrated in that city from the 16th to the 23rd days of April, in the present year, the deliberations of that assembly were turned to the observance of the holy time of Advent. And as considerable difference existed in the mode of observing the fasts and abstinences thereof, in several churches of these United States, the fathers were advised by their consultors, that it would be useful to assimilate, as nearly as may be easily practicable upon this head, the observances and customs of churches so close-

ly united together, and whose members had such frequent intercourse. The fathers of the council themselves entering fully into the views of their consultors, for the reasons by which they were sustained, determined to submit their views, together with those reasons, to our holy father Pope Gregory XVI., the visible head on earth of our holy church; so that by his sanction the change of discipline which they regarded as useful might, according to the canons and usages of the church, and according to the divine institution, be duly established and confirmed.

The usage of several of our churches has been, to observe the Wednesdays of Advent and the Fridays of Advent, as days of fasting and of abstinence from flesh-meat; as also the Wednesday, Friday, and Saturday after the third Sunday of Advent, as days of fast and abstinence, as being ember-days or days of quarter-tense; also that the vigil of the nativity of our Lord, or Christmas Eve, should be observed as a day of fasting and abstinence, unless the said vigil should happen on Sunday, in which case the fast and abstinence should be observed on the previous Saturday. Such has hitherto been the usage of this diocess.

The council, amongst other things, besought the sanction of the holy father to the following relaxation, viz.: "That in those places within the United States of North America, where the obligation of fast and abstinence existed on the Wednesdays in Advent, this obligation should cease, except as regards the Wednesday after the third Sunday in Advent, or Wednesday in ember-week, and also except the vigil of the nativity of our Lord should happen on Wednesday." Which relaxation has been acceded to by the holy father: and the decree of communicating the same has been transmitted by the Holy See to the Archbishop of Baltimore, and been communicated by him to the several bishops of the United States.

We do, therefore, by these presents, notify to you that the obligation of fasting and of abstinence no longer exists in this, our Diocess of Charleston, on the Wednesdays of Advent, unless on that Wednesday which is in ember-week, and on that Wednesday on which the vigil of the nativity of our Lord, that is the 24th of December, shall happen; but that the obligation of fasting and abstinence on the other days remains of the same force as it has been heretofore.

And now, brethren, permit us to exhort you, that you enter fully into the spirit of the holy time, which is a period of preparation for the Advent or coming of our Lord Jesus Christ to be spiritually born in our souls, by the influence of his grace, at the holy festival of

Christmas. This will be most effectually done, if, entering into the proper dispositions, you prepare yourselves by repentance and the sacrament of penance, with consciences cleansed from the stains of sin, to receive, with souls purified by the blood of the Saviour, the holy Sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist, on this great commemoration of the nativity of our Lord. Supply, then, in place of those works of fasting and of abstinence, no longer of disciplinary obligation, a wholesome correction of your passions, by abstaining from the occasions of sin, by prayer, by alms-deeds, and by those other practices which will, through the merits of your Saviour, render you acceptable to heaven. Be renewed in the spirit of your vocation, prepare not only for the advent of this festival which approaches and is now near at hand, but also for that other advent, the day and the hour of which it is not given to us to discover, the coming of the angel of death, who will separate your souls from your bodies, and will present you for judgment before that God whose coming is dreaded by sinners, but in whose arrival the just will rejoice.

May the Lord in his infinite mercy, beloved, enable us so to turn to a proper account the disciplinary regulations of his church, as that preserving the unchanging faith which it teaches, adhering to the sound morality which it proclaims, submitting to the authority with which it is endowed, and partaking of the sacraments which it dispenses, we may through the graces and the merits of its Founder be brought to that glory and happiness to which it directs us.

Given under our hand at Charleston, this 27th day of November, in the year of our Lord, 1837.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By order of the Bishop.

R. S. BAKER, *Secretary.*

PASTORAL LETTERS

ON THE ELECTION OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

John England, by the grace of God and with the approbation of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved flock, the Roman Catholics of the said Diocess, especially to our venerable brethren the Clergy—health and blessing:

Beloved Brethren:—The great object of religion is to sanctify

man, and thus fit him for eternal happiness: but man is best sanctified in the moment when his passions are subdued; and he is most exposed to danger when they are excited. War is not only calamitous in its effects upon society, but is injurious to religion by destroying charity and by exciting the passions. For the same reason the mal-administration of government by those to whom it has been committed, is injurious to religion, because it produces innumerable evils, and excites the worst passions. Hence it is the duty of a religious man frequently to address himself to the throne of grace to obtain from the Giver of every good gift, peace and good government for his country, that thereby our Heavenly Father may be induced to place him in such circumstances as would afford to him and to others, the fairest opportunity of walking uninterruptedly in the path of his commandments, and would procure for him and his fellow-creatures, those temporal comforts which it is lawful to seek, and to use with moderation.

Hence the sacred Scriptures and the other records of religion exhibit to us from the earliest periods, the priest and the people uniting in their sacrifices and supplications to obtain from the eternal God the gifts of wisdom, fortitude, and moderation, for the governors of the land, and of peace and plenty for its inhabitants. The apostolic injunctions teach us our obligations; the examples of the fathers and the spirit of the church are perfectly consonant to the great principles which we derive from the acts and expressions of our blessed Redeemer, and from those other venerable sources.

This, brethren, is in our land an interesting epoch. Our people have regulated that at stated times their chief magistrate shall lay down the power which he has received from them to exercise in their name for the public welfare. They have used their right, and exercised their power in giving a successor in the presidential office to that excellent citizen who has, during a considerable time, discharged its duties so much to their satisfaction, to his own credit, and to the prosperity of our confederated republics: and this successor is to be solemnly bound by oath to the proper performance of the duties of his high office on the 4th of next month.

Our faith teaches us that the aid of the Most High is necessary to enable us not only to resist temptation and to practise virtue, but also to discharge, in a proper way, the obligations of our several special states in life, and the higher the state, the more arduous are its duties the greater is the difficulty of their correct fulfilment, the more do we stand in need of the special grace of God for our aid. He, who by the

desire of the people holds an office for the public good, has a claim upon the people's exertion on his behalf.

It was not our province, beloved brethren, to have interfered with your right of freely acting in the selection of the citizen who was to fill the dignified chair of the President of the United States: nor is it our province to express any sentiment upon the choice which has been made. But it is our duty to bow to the decision which the people have made according to the forms which our constitution has prescribed, and to believe that the preservation of that constitution is of more importance than the selection of any individual; and also, that in such a government as ours, the ready and cheerful acquiescence of each, to the expressed will of the constitutional majority, is a solemn obligation. It is then our province to invite you to the performance of your religious duty: to assemble you together for the purpose of offering up the holy sacrifice of the Mass and our united prayers, to beseech the eternal God, through the merits of our blessed Redeemer, his beloved son Jesus Christ, to bless the administration of the new President; to guide his councils by wisdom; to confirm them in fortitude; to endow them with moderation; to make them loved and useful at home, feared and respected abroad; and to grant to our republics peace, strength, union, and prosperity; to fasten in bands of charity, not only our several states and territories, but also our several denominations of inhabitants, so that we may put away from amongst us every spirit of bitterness, contention, and envy, and having but one heart and one soul, we may behold truth, preserve peace; and strengthened in our Union, blessed by our God, and edifying the world, strenuously maintain, and faithfully transmit to future generations, those valuable blessings of civil freedom and unrestricted right of riligious worship, of which we are generally partakers in this happy land.

Wherefore we desire, that on Friday, the fourth of March, the Solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost, shall be offered up in the several churches of this diocess, at the usual hour at which Mass is celebrated on festivals, and that the prayers which we have appointed for the occasion, shall also be offered up at the same time, to obtain from our merciful God, the above blessings; and we invite the several congregations to assist thereat in a becoming and edifying manner, so that we may draw down upon our states the favour and protection of the Most High.

Given at Charleston, on the 21st day of February, in the year of our Lord, 1825.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE JUBILEE OF 1826

John England, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved and faithful in Christ, the clergy and laity of the Diocess of Charleston, health and blessing.

Beloved Brethren:—Remote as is our situation from the centre of Christian unity, and humble as is our place amongst the pastors of the Universal Church, still we are not forgotten in the day of the glory and of the joy of our brethren. We are recognized by the successor of Peter, and to us has been conveyed that blessing of which the most ancient and venerable sees have been made partakers. Our lot, it is true, has been cast upon the verge of the wilderness, our place is amongst those to whom we have been strangers and to whom our church has been misrepresented; our flock is small, and our few churches are remote from each other; many of our children are scattered singly abroad amongst those who neither know their tenets or their practices; like Juda in captivity, they have been for many days without a priest, without an altar, without a sacrifice.—When the cry of their application to us for aid rings in our ears, we are in the midst of them, like a father to whom his children cry for bread, and he has not wherewith to satisfy their hunger. Our heart hath been oppressed, our eyes have been filled with tears, we have sighed for our forlorn situation. But a heavier affliction hath befallen us, and our soul hath been more grievously wounded. We have spread out the table, we have made the feast, we have given the invitations, and they whom we called have answered us, with vain excuses, that they could not come: like those mentioned in the Gospel; one said that he purchased oxen, another that he bought a farm, and others that they would not come: thus they from whom we were removed besought us for the sacraments, and they amongst whom we dwelt, and to whom the bread of life was proffered, refused to receive this heavenly sustenance. Living in the open disregard of every great and important law of the church, they still boasted of their membership, and they tenaciously adhered to a religion whose first principles they habitually violated, whose ordinances they despised, and whose sacraments they slighted. This indeed has been to us a most humiliating affliction. With outstretched arms, we have besought their return, but we addressed ourselves to a people that took no concern for a world to come, to a people who heeded not, but who contradicted.—How often in imitation of him with whose commission, though unworthy, we are

invested, have we desired to gather you under the wings of his divine protection, when we beheld temptation and ruin hovering above?—But you would not!—How often have we preached the word, in season, out of season, reproved, entreated, rebuked and exhorted?—But in vain!—How often have we addressed our unworthy supplications to him who holds in his hands the hearts of men, who from the very stones can raise up children to Abraham?—But we were not worthy, and our prayer was not granted. Indeed, we became weary, our knees were weak, and we were almost tempted to despair. But we have been roused from our despondency. The trumpet hath been blown in the holy city; its sound hath gone forth through every land, and its notes have been heard at the extremities of the earth; the people of God have been awakened, and they have begun to prepare for judgment. Not for that to which Michaels shall rouse them, but for that to which they are exhorted to judge themselves now that they may not be judged with severity hereafter. From every quarter the glad tidings arrive that the proclamation of the Jubilee hath been the signal for exertion, the kingdom of heaven suffers violence, and the violent bear it away. The aspirations of the faithful are wafted on every breeze, the great truths of religion are everywhere announced, refreshing waters flow to a thirsting people from him who was struck for our iniquities and by whose bruises we are healed: the blood of the Lamb is sprinkled upon the congregated millions. They whose sins were as red as scarlet appear in robes of innocence whiter than snow: they have come with their burdens and have found relief, they have been under heavy labour, but they have found rest to their souls; they have risen from the midst of swine, they have rejected the husks, they have rushed into the arms of their weeping father, they have been clothed with his grace, they have feasted with his friends, they have been inebriated with his delights, they have received the ring which conveys the inheritance. They enjoy that peace which the world cannot give; which the world cannot take away. The breathing incense of the morning rises loaded with the prayer of their gratitude, the sun smiles upon their good deeds, the song of their praise gives hope, as the shadows of night thicken about them, and they repose under the guardianship of angels and the protection of their God. How hath our heart bounded at reading the simple yet glowing details of the conversion of sinners, the progress of the just; the fervour of penitents, the restitutions of the unjust, the reconcilement of enemies, the putting away of the occasions of sin, the dissolution of criminal engagements, the solemnization of matri-

mony, the applications for confession, the crowded pressure for communion, the disappearance of crime and the progress of virtue, in every place where the Jubilee hath been celebrated. But how speedily were we humbled and dejected when we looked around us at home? Beloved, let us hope for better things—to us also is the invitation given, and though we have been unworthy, perhaps the prayers of our brethren in the faith will be heard in conjunction with our own. When a united world prays, a merciful God will listen, and be compassionate and bountiful. But let us place no obstacle to his grace: let us not close our eyes to the light: let us not stop our ears against instruction: let us be earnest in prayer, and let us not wilfully harden our hearts, and we too shall rise resuscitated by the Saviour.

Beloved Brethren: our holy father Pope Leo XII., whom may God long preserve, following the example of his pious and venerable predecessors, did, on the eve of the nativity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the year 1824, by the opening of the holy gate in the basilic of the church of St. Peter, commence the celebration of the holy year of Jubilee, and after the most beneficial results had accrued, did, on the festival of the nativity of our Lord in the year 1825, close the same gate, and thus after the lapse of a year, terminated the sacred and venerable solemnity: and on the eighth of the calends of January, 1825, (25th of December,) he issued apostolic letters, to the Catholic world, extending to all the faithful, wheresoever the ordinary prelates should publish the same, similar favours [to] those obtained at Rome during the year of the Jubilee, upon the conditions which he specified therein, and during six months to be computed from the day of the publication of those letters in each diocess. On the feast of the circumcision of our Lord, (January 1st,) 1826, being the 14th year of the Roman Indiction, the aforesaid letters were duly published at the gates of the Lateran, and other basilics in the city of Rome, as also at the gates of the Apostolic Chancery, and other usual places, and duly authenticated copies thereof transmitted to all the prelates of the Catholic world: a copy thereof hath been received by us, and this day, hath been duly published in our cathedral.

And on the 8th day of January, 1826, his holiness Pope Leo XII. granted at an audience to the prelates of churches in those places where the Catholic religion was not fully and extensively established, power to dispense with the fulfilment of several of the conditions prescribed in those letters, and also power to extend the period of the Jubilee to any time not exceeding two years from the day of its publication, which grant of power hath been received by us as appears by the

testimony of the document in that effect, transmitted to us by the Congregation of Cardinals, *de propaganda fide*, sealed with their seal, and signed by their secretary, the Most Reverend Peter Caprano, Archbishop if Iconium, and which copy hath also been published this day.

We have thus exhibited to you, beloved brethren, that we are clothed with the power of the Holy See in the premises. It therefore rests with us, to show you the existence, and the nature of this power: as also to exhibit the benefits which accrue from its exercise, to carry those powers into execution, and to entreat of you, dearly beloved, to profit by this most favourable opportunity.

The celebration of the Jubilee is then the extensive communication of a plenary indulgence. As members of the church, we believe, in the words of the Council of Trent, that "the power of granting indulgences was left by Christ in the church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to the Christian people." But since, unfortunately, gross abuses, and glaring superstitions have sometimes, through the wickedness of men, accompanied their publication, the enemies of religion have thence taken occasion to argue, from their abuse, against their excellence, their utility, and their existence as a portion of the divine institution. Far be it from us, brethren, to deny the existence of known truth, that we may thus endeavour to shield truth by using falsehoods. Our doctrine needs not such aid, if it did, it could not be the doctrine of God; for what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?—We do not deny that abuses and superstitions have existed in the church, and may yet occasionally and even extensively exist, but we deny that the doctrine which the church has always held and does now hold is favourable to abuse or founded upon superstition. Several of our brethren, who are unfortunately separated from our church, with the best and kindest dispositions, view our doctrine upon this subject in such a light, as necessarily must lead every good and reasonable person who so views it, to its condemnation. It frequently happens that they hold a most correct principle, but are in error respecting the fact; and every one must acknowledge that a conclusion correctly drawn from premises, one of which is erroneous, must necessarily be itself an error: it matters not for this result whether the error of the premises existed in the principle, or in the fact. As therefore, beloved brethren, our intercourse with those who differ from us, upon this head of doctrine, is extensive, we have thought it right upon the present occasion to explain somewhat at length respecting the doctrine of indulgences as well for confirming

you in your faith, as, perhaps, removing some of the mistakes under which our fellow Christians, who are unfortunately separated from us, labour. Still we can, in this address, only exhibit to you a distinct outline: nor do we enter at any length upon the reasoning by which our propositions may be supported.

We shall begin by stating whence the name of indulgence hath been assumed, and considering its original object. In the lxi. chapter of Isaias is written: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord hath anointed me: he hath sent me to preach to the meek, to heal the contrite of heart, and to preach a release to the captives, and deliverance to them that are shut up, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." In the iv. chapter of the Gospel according to St. Luke, it is related that in the synagogue at Nazareth our blessed Saviour applied this passage to himself and to his office. The word which in those passages is translated by release or remission is that which at the time of the translation of the sacred volume, and in the earliest ages was used to signify what we call an indulgence. In the first epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, (chapter vii. v. 6,) we read, "But this I speak by indulgence not by commandment," here the phrase means condescension. In the church language, both meanings are united and an indulgence means "a remission of penalty granted through condescension to human weakness."

The passage of Isaias is a clear and finely alluding reference to that institution of the Mosaic law which is called the Jubilee; the great year of remission and release, (Levit. xxv. 10.) "And thou shalt sanctify the fiftieth year, and shalt proclaim remission to all the inhabitants of the land: for it is the year of Jubilee. Every man shall return to his possession, every one shall go back to his former family; 11. Because it is the Jubilee of the fiftieth year, you shall not sow, nor reap the things that grow in the field of their own accord, neither shall you gather the first fruits of the vines; 12. Because of the sanctification of the Jubille; but as they grow you shall presently eat them: 13. In the year of the Jubilee, all shall return to their old possessions." Thus in the year of the Jubilee besides all returning to their old possessions, they lived upon the fruits of the former years; and they of the house of Israel who were in servitude were permitted to go free.

Bearing these things in mind we perceive the meaning of the expression more clearly. We may still further discover it from its use on other occasions in the early days of Christianity; thus when convicted criminals were suffering under the operation of the sentence of the law, on several occasions, the emperors in thanksgiving for

some favour, or to commemorate some joyful event, or for other sufficient cause, granted a remission of the penalty, and ordered a release of the prisoners then under sentence. This was called an indulgence. Thus it is manifest, that in those days no person imagined that an indulgence was previous permission granted to commit crime: the meaning was clearly what we have already seen, that an indulgence was an act of clemency, or condescension to human weakness, by means whereof the entire or a portion of the penalty due to his crime was granted to a delinquent. And in ecclesiastical language it always meant, the remission by proper authority, to a penitent, of the whole, or of a part of the temporary penalty which remains due to sin after the removal of the guilt, by God's mercy, the merits of the Saviour, and the due repentance of the sinner. It never meant, nor could it be construed to mean that the church arrogated to herself power or authority to grant leave for future sin; to make lawful what God had forbidden, to create a traffic upon crime. Beloved, you know, and we call you to witness before God with us, that such an abominable and blasphemous doctrine hath never been taught amongst us. We detest, abjure, condemn, and anathematize such execrable propositions. Yet we have been represented to our fellow-citizens as holding, teaching, and maintaining this as the doctrine of our church; when we have denied that it was ours, we were told, that although we might conceal it here, yet that such was the doctrine of our church, in France, in Spain, in Italy, in Germany. Brethren, you are not only Americans, and natives of Ireland, of Scotland, and of England; but in this city, you are natives of Italy, of Germany, of France, of Spain, of Portugal, of the West Indies, of South America, and of various other parts of the civilized world. We appeal to you before that God who will judge us all, and call upon you to say, if in any one of those countries, or in any country in which you have been, our church taught that an indulgence was leave to commit sin, or that it was even remission of a sin, or of the penalty of a sin, without due antecedent repentance. If we assert a public falsehood, and you by your silence acquiesce therein, you will not escape condemnation at the tribunal of God's judgment.

No, brethren, an indulgence is not leave granted to commit sin, nor is it the forgiveness of sin committed. It is but the remission of the penalty which still remains due even to the penitent and forgiven sinner. We proceed to show that such penalty remains due, and that, by the institution of our Saviour, it may be remitted by means of an indulgence.

Our object not being to enter into proofs, but to allude to the

foundations of our doctrine for your instruction, we shall on this first head be content with giving you a few facts with which you must be familiar. We distinguish between guilt and its penalty: guilt is the offence of God: penalty is the punishment which is inflicted upon the offender: all his punishments are not of the same exact measure; according to the degrees of guilt, so are the degrees of infliction made by this God of justice: mercy is frequently exhibited in the substitution for a more grievous punishment of one which is more light. That God hath frequently been merciful in this manner, the holy Scriptures bear ample and multiplied testimony. Thus in Exodus xxxii. we find that God sentenced the Israelities to destruction for their idolatry, and in v. 14, he extends mercy to them, upon the supplication of Moses; in v. 34, he declares his extension of mercy is a suspension or commutation of punishment. In chapter xxxiii. we read of the repentance of the people for the same crime, and of a further concession of mercy upon the supplication of Moses; so that the first remission was not complete. In the *Book of Numbers* (xiv.) we read again of their criminal conduct and the extension of mercy upon the intercession of their leader, but this extension is only a commutation of a greater into a less punishment, for in vv. 22 and 23, we find that they were saved from destruction, but sentenced to be excluded from the land of promise—and in vv. 29, and those subsequent, the fact is more clearly exhibited. In the xxiv. of the *Second Book of Kings*, otherwise, of Samuel, and in the xxi. of *Paralipomenon or Chronicles*, after David's repentance, and the removal of his guilt, through the merits of a future Redeemer, and the taking away the punishment of hell, which was the penalty of his crime, a temporary punishment is substituted for that which is eternal. In like manner, in the same book of *Kings* (chapter xii.), we find that God upon the repentance of David, took away his sin as to its guilt, and of course as to the effect of eternal punishment, but still he inflicted a temporary punishment, which the prophet immediately declares: here David upon repentance was forgiven, as was Adam upon his repentance, but the effects of this forgiveness through the merits of our Lord Jesus Christ in each case, because there is no other name in which we can be saved, were the removal of guilt, and the remission of the eternal punishment. Yet in each case we find a temporary punishment substituted; in the case of Adam, that in the sweat of his brow he should earn his bread, besides a variety of other calamities: in the case of David, the death of his child in one instance, and in another, a choice of heavy afflictions. In a vast number of places, the holy Scriptures of the old and of the new law testify to this merciful

substitution of a temporary punishment inflicted upon the penitent sinner, instead of the eternal punishment which is remitted together with the guilt, through the merits of our Saviour, when the sinner repents. Thus the universal church hath received at its formation, and preserved to this day, the doctrine, that sin is forgiven, as to its guilt, only upon the repentance of the offender, through the merits of the Saviour: that the guilt being thus remitted, the eternal pains of hell are also remitted, but that generally, a temporary punishment hath been substituted therefor. Which of us, brethren, can dwell with everlasting burning? Oh! how light and trivial are the longest and most afflicting temporary pains when compared with the hopeless, endless affliction of the deliberate, unrepenting transgressor! Well, indeed, may we style those who, after the temporary punishment either in this world or in the next, are admitted to the eternal enjoyment of glory, a holy nation, a purchased people, a chosen generation, the living stones of a glorious, heavenly building! How sedulously have the saints laboured, even after they had good grounds for hope, that their iniquity had been taken away and their sins removed; that through prayers and supplications, through fasting and almsdeeds, through mortification and penance, they might, through the merits of the Saviour, be washed yet more from their sins, by the removal of even this effect of temporary punishment? Thus David besought the Lord for the child of which he was threatened to be deprived; and David kept a fast, and going in by himself he lay upon the ground, saying, who knoweth but the Lord may give him to me, and the child may live. So the great Apostle St. Paul testified to the Colossians that in his own flesh he filled up those things which are wanting in the sufferings of Christ, and called upon them to mortify their members which are upon the earth, being instant in prayer, watching in it with all thanksgiving. Those works have, by virtue of the Saviour's merits, not only merit before God, but, moreover, are satisfactory for the purpose of inducing him to remit the whole or a part of the temporary punishment which remains due to sin after the guilt and the eternal punishment are remitted. Thus the Prophet Daniel advises King Nebuchadonosor, (iv. 24,) "redeem thou thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor:" because, as it is written in the Book of *Tobias,* iv. 11, "For alms deliver from all sin, and from death, and will not suffer the soul to go into darkness." St. John Chrysostom, commenting upon the Acts of the Apostles, states that there is not a sin for the clearing away of which alms-deeds will not be efficacious; and St. Cyprian, in his sermon on alms-giving, says that by alms and good

works the blaze of crimes is overcome; in allusion to that passage of the sacred volume, *Eccles.* iii. 33, "water quencheth a flaming fire; and alms resisteth sins." In all which and in many other places we discover that there is a quality of satisfaction to divine justice for our sins in those works, when done in the true spirit of religion, and united with the merits of the Saviour. Fasting hath plainly this quality, as may be gathered from a multitude of facts and passages: amongst which are those of David, who ate ashes as bread and mingled his drink with weeping; and the earlier facts of the conduct of the Israelites in the desert, when they sought to obtain remission of the penalties to which they were sentenced, the strong passages and ardent invitations of Joel, and its effects, as found in the book of Jonas. Thus by a cloud of witnesses we are led to the knowledge of the satisfactory nature of those works. That they are meritorious, or deserving of reward through the merits of the Saviour, is equally plain; for the Saviour, in the *Gospel of St. Matthew,* chapter xxv., promises the kingdom of Heaven as a reward to those who, with proper dispositions, bestow alms; so, too, in the sixth chapter of the same gospel, he declares worthy of reward, those who fast with proper dispositions, and those who pray as they ought.

The merit by which a claim to reward is created, is always in the person who performs the work, and cannot be communicated to another; but the value of the satisfaction by which penalty might be removed is, by the common principle of reason, and by the special institutions of religion communicable to others. Thus he who hath claims may, upon their value, do benefit to another. We cannot make him who is without merit, have claim to reward; but if we, even through mercy, have claims upon the ground of satisfaction, the value of this claim might by us be relinquished in favour of another, to obtain mercy for him, not to obtain reward. Thus when Moses prays to the Lord for the pardon of Israel, he in one place beseeches him to remember Abraham, and Isaac, and Israel his servants, (*Exod.* xxxii. 13;) and in another place (xxxiii. 13), he intreats of God favour for the people on his own account: "If I have found favour in thy sight." In another place Moses informs us, (*Deut.* ix. 27,) that he besought for the people, by drawing the notice of the Most High to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob; and in the book of the Prophet Jeremiah, xv. 1, the Lord himself declares that "if Moses and Samuel should stand before him, his soul is not towards that people." This communion of satisfactory works hath, from the earliest ages of the church, been one of her tenets, and the principle upon which it is founded, is the great principle

of redemption, because we are redeemed, not by our own satisfaction, but by being made partakers of the satisfaction made by him by whose bruises we are healed, Christ Jesus, who was made the propitiation for our sins. He hath satisfied, and he only hath fully satisfied, but we are all made partakers of the satisfaction.

As the beloved Apostle says, (II *John* ii. 1, 2,) "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Christ Jesus the Just: and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world." Thus he purchased his church with his blood as is stated in another place (*Acts* xx. 28), by another Apostle: and, as St. Peter says, in his first epistle, iii. 18, "Christ died once for our sins, the just for the unjust, that he might offer us to God;" and in another place, (II *Cor.* v. 15,) "Christ died for all." His propitiation, his satisfaction had infinite value, and though all should have profited thereof, still would it be superabundant. But leaving this view of speculation let us confine ourselves to the fact, that all do not partake of his merits, for "many are called but few are chosen," (*Matt.* xx. 16;) "for wide is the gate and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many there are who enter by it," (*Matt.* vii. 13.) Thus there remains superabundant satisfaction from the propitiation of our Saviour, for he is "holy, innocent, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens, who needeth not, daily, as other priests, to offer up sacrifices first for his own sins," (*Heb.* vii. 26;) for he "did no sin, neither was there guile found in his mouth." (I *Peter* ii. 22.) Thus in the merits of the Saviour there exists not only only the satisfaction necessary for the removal of guilt and the remission of eternal punishment to the repentant sinner, but also a superabundance which may be applicable to the removal of the temporary punishment sometimes due to sins after they are removed.

Another doctrine of our church, upon which it would be here unnecessary for us to treat, but that we would not omit it, less it might appear to be either an abandonment, or an undervaluing thereof, is that besides the superabundant satisfaction of the Saviour thus applicable to the remission of such temporary punishment, there exists a superabundance of the satisfactory works of the saints, similarly but limitedly applicable. As we do not here enter upon a field of debate or controversy, we shall merely explain, but not argue in support of this proposition. We acknowledge that whatever those saints have received, they have received from God, and, therefore, upon that ground there exists a wide difference between their merits and those of Christ. We also assert that without redemption by Christ, and the application

of his grace, their works would not have merit worthy of eternal life, nor would their satisfactory works be available. Thus we do not set them above Christ, we do not place them on a level with him, but we believe them to be, not only under him, but dependent upon him, and indebted to him for what they possess; hence, when we extol their merits or works, so far are we from detracting from those of the Saviour, that we exhibit their greater value in the excellence of their fruits, which are the merits of the saints, and the value of their works.

Let us now examine what is meant by their superabundance. We speak not of the superabundance of merit, but of works of satisfaction or of expiation; and we speak not of eternal, but of temporary punishment. Many, of those saints or holy persons, like Magdalen, had perfect love of God, and not only was their guilt and the eternal punishment remitted, but, through the value of Christ's satisfaction, all punishment was remitted. Thus nothing of satisfaction or expiation was claimed by heaven, for it had remitted or inflicted the entire by mercy and justice. Yet still they continued their works of satisfaction, offering not only for themselves, but interceding and praying for their fellow-members. Some, as St. John the Baptist and the Blessed Virgin, were free, by a special grace and favour of God, from any or from grievous sins, yet they continued during years to perform works of satisfaction. Whosoever considers the lives and sufferings of the Apostles, and martyrs, and other great saints, will perceive what we mean by their superabundant satisfaction. Thus, though we distinguish their works from the redemption of the Saviour, still all are ultimately merged in the original value of redemption. Thus we say that the superabundant satisfaction of Christ and of the saints forms, in the church, a treasure applicable to the purpose of indulgences. The redemption from the guilt of sin and from eternal death is effected in all the saints, solely by the merits of the expiatory offering of the Saviour: but having by his merits been thus redeemed, their satisfactory acts, enriched by its merits, may, and frequently do, exceed the specific sum of the temporary punishment which according to the scale of his justice is affixed to be substituted for the eternal punishment, which is remitted, together with the guilt: and it now remains for us to show that Christ left in his church the power of indulgences that is the power of applying, upon reasonable grounds, the benefit of this superabundant satisfaction to sinners who are truly penitent.

We here have no question respecting those sinners who do not leave iniquity, and repent of their sin; for them we have no hope: neither prayer, nor sacrifice, nor sacrament, nor indulgence can pro-

duce in them reconciliation to Heaven, during their affection and attachment to sin. We need not stop to refute the imputation of the blasphemy, that an indulgence is leave to commit sin, neither need we now argue to show that it does not remit sin; because it is only a remission of the temporary punishment which is due to sin after the remission of the guilt and of the eternal punishment by God, through the repentance of the sinner and by the merits of the Saviour; and this remission of temporary punishment is like the Jubilee of the Israelites, as it were living upon the fruits which have been already gathered in the previous years by the satisfactory works of the Saviour and the saints. It is a condescension to human weakness, by applying through the communion of saints, by the power of the church, those superabundant satisfactions to aid our tepidity, and to encourage our exertion. Thus, being members of the same body, as the Apostle says in his *Epistle to the Romans,* chapter xii., we aid one another, as he also exhibits in his *First Epistle to the Corinthians,* chapter xii., and in divers other places, where he mentions his own works communicated to them. In the *Gospel of St. John,* we read of the power of remission of sins given by the communication of the Holy Ghost, through our Saviour to the Apostles, (xx. 22, 23.) This not only includes the authority for the remission of guilt and its immediate consequence, by the power of the Holy Ghost, and through the merits of Christ to the truly penitent, but also, as the universal testimony of the church hath ever exhibited, the application of the superabundant merits for the remission of the temporary punishment; and the more unlimited expressions in *St. Matthew,* vi. 19, make it, if possible, still more clear: and in chapter xviii. 17, 18, and so forth, of the same gospel, it is made yet more strongly evident; that it was practised in every age, we have the most ample testimonies. We begin with the act of St. Paul, as related in his *Second Epistle to the Corinthians,* chapter ii. 10, where, by the authority of Christ, he released from grievous penance a repentant sinner. If this were a release from penance only, it would be no favour or condescension, for the temporary punishment would still remain due; nor would the authority of Christ be necessary, for the mere discharge from the observance of a human regulation; but the authority of Christ would be necessary for the act of condescension, by which the superabundant merits were applied to a release from penance and from penalty, so that God was satisfied, and man was liberated. The monuments and documents, by which evidence exists of the practice having been thus perpetuated by divine authority in the church, abound in every subsequent age. We would lay them

before you, but you need them not, and we have been already too prolix. We shall therefore now sum up our explanation. An indulgence is an authoritative application made by the church, by the power delegated to her by Jesus Christ, of the superabundant satisfaction of the Redeemer and of the saints, through condescension to the weakness of her children, by which she either totally or partially, for good cause, remits to sinners who have been duly reconciled to God by repentance and the sacraments, the whole or a part of the temporary punishment which still sometimes remains due to sin, even when through the satisfaction and merits of the Saviour the guilt is taken away, and the eternal punishment is remitted.

We need not dwell here at any length to express our astonishment, that persons who ought to be well informed, should persevere in still charging us, against all evidence, with making indulgences a traffic in sin. We have indeed been shocked and afflicted at finding, in this land of freedom, where men so eagerly seek after truth, publications recently set forth, charging us with holding that leave might be given by the pastors of the church to commit certain crimes, at stipulated rates. No such abominable principle was ever taught in any portion of our church: it is a principle not only in direct violation of religious truth and purity, but subversive of the very constitution of society. Did any one hold such a principle, he should not be tolerated in any country; because, if a person thought that by paying a certain price, and that a very moderate one too, he could obtain from heaven permission to commit a crime, or pardon for one committed, no one could be safe from his hatred, his malice, or his self-interest. May God forgive those who, for their own purposes, thus misrepresent us to our fellow-citizens, mislead those who search after knowledge of the way of life, and not only bear false witness against us, but also against the truth of God to the perpetuation of error, and the continuance of enmity! Those misrepresentations have not had their origin here, but they have been here most widely extended.

The plenary indulgence of the Jubilee has been given by the Popes at different periods, to encourage and to admonish the faithful to exertion, so that they may enter into possession of that inheritance which was made theirs at baptism, but which they unfortunately cast away for a trifling gratification of criminal indulgence: to engage them to seek release from that spiritual bondage in which they have been led by their passions, and now to walk abroad in the liberty of children of God, and to return to their kindred and family, and to enjoy the citizenship of the saints. Thus several of the Popes granted indulgences

to those who, with proper dispositions, visited at stated times the ancient and venerable churches of the capital of the Christian world, those repositories of the sacred relics of the earliest times, and splendid memorials of our fathers in the faith. How must the heart be affected at kneeling where Peter prayed, and how must the soul melt with devotion at the spot where Paul was beheaded? It is doubtless true that the God of Peter and of Paul fills the world with his presence, and will listen to the supplication of the contrite and humble heart which is borne upon the rude gale, from the drenched mariner, with equal mercy as he will to that which is raised in the midst of incense, and accompanied by the swelling notes which enrich the ceremonial of the father of the faithful. But man is aided by circumstance, and the solid lessons of religion are better taught and more deeply impressed, and we are more excited to worship in spirit and in truth, by the aid of external worship, and the very circumstance of time and place. The patriot will feel the truth of the remark upon those spots which have been consecrated to the welfare of his country, and the recollections of victory: the Christian will feel it at the tombs of the martyrs, and the conviction will rush upon him with a tide of irresistible evidence when he treads upon the plains of Judea, and when he enters the sacred temple of the eternal city. Pope Clement VI. regulated that this great indulgence should be given every fiftieth year, and thereupon gave it the name of the year of Jubilee. It has latterly been usual to celebrate it every twenty-fifth year; and after one year's celebration in the holy city, to extend it to the several diocesses of the universal church, as is done on the present occasion.

We therefore announce, that it is this day extended to this diocess. But, as we are as yet scarcely organized, and in great want of clergymen, and our few churches under very dissimilar circumstances, we cannot make the special conditions the same in all. We shall, therefore, regulate the specialty for each according to its circumstances.

The true repentance for sin, a sincere conversion of the heart to God, a firm resolution of leading a truly Christian life according to the maxims of the Gospel; and for those who have the opportunity, the receiving of the sacraments of penance and the Eucharist, as well as repeating with devotion the prayers for the grace of light to the ignorant, conversion to the knowledge and profession of truth to those who err, and of a change of heart and disposition to sinners, are indispensably necessary to obtain its benefits.

The principal, indeed, the only object of the Jubilee, is the conversion of sinners to God. You are yourselves invited, in the first in-

stance to desert iniquity, that it may not be your ruin. Your sanctification is then the first object, and the extraordinary aid now held out is merely to excite you to be reconciled to Heaven; for you have too often, yielding to frivolous excuses, deferred your return to your God. You cannot without being sanctified, obtain any benefit of the indulgence; you cannot be sanctified whilst you remain attached to sin: whilst your hearts are not filled with true sorrow for your sins; you cannot have this true sorrow without a fixed resolution to avoid future transgression, and a perfect renunciation of all affection to sin. For sanctity cannot exist with crime, God with Baal. Thus to participate in the bountiful dispensation of the treasures of the church, you must necessarily exercise yourselves in acts of penance, which chiefly consists in a change of heart, a turning off from sin, and in a fixed determination to serve God with an inviolable fidelity.

Wherefore, dearly beloved, "We helping do exhort you, that you receive not the grace of God in vain. For he said: in an acceptable time I have received thee: and in the day of salvation I have helped thee. Behold now is the acceptable time: behold now is the day of salvation," (II *Cor.* iv. 1, 2.) "Wherefore, as the Holy Ghost saith, to-day, if you hear his voice, harden not your hearts, as in the day of the provocation," (*Heb.* iii. 7, 8.) "Having a high priest who hath penetrated the heavens, Jesus the Son of God; let us hold fast to our confession. For we have not a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirmities; but one tempted in all things like as we are, yet without sin. Let us go, therefore, with confidence to the throne of grace; that we may obtain mercy and find grace in seasonable aid," (*Heb.* iv. 14, 15, 16.) Do, brethren, although you have permitted years to pass away, in neglect: although you have conformed in this sinful world, preferring its principles to the maxims of the Gospel, although you have "left your first charity; be mindful from whence you are fallen: and do penance; and do the first works," (*Apoc.* ii. 5.) "Rise, you that sleep, and arise from the sinful dead, and Christ will enlighten you. Become not unwise, but understanding what is the will of God. And be not drunk with wine, wherein is luxury: but be ye filled with the Holy Spirit," (*Ephes.* v. 14.) Do, brethren, walk worthy of your vocation as sons of the most high God; here below you are but passengers of a day; but your true land of inheritance is heaven. You have neglected to meditate upon this, you have persuaded yourselves that your lives were to continue, you have had no thought for the latter times: you have kept from the view of eternity. Yet, alas! mark your folly, because here you have no lasting habitation. Where are your

fathers! Have they not descended to the grave? Is not their bed rottenness, and the worm their brother: are not their very bones consumed? Go and meditate upon their tombs: ask them concerning life: and ask them concerning eternity. The hollow voice of the mighty dead will pour its solemn sound into your ears, and some of them will be heard declaring how they were misled through life, and thus they seemed to reason. "The time of our life is short and tedious; and in the end of a man there is no remedy; and no man hath been known to have returned from hell: for we are born of nothing; and after this we shall be as if we had not been: for the breath in our nostrils is smoke: and speech a spark to move our heart, which being put out, our body shall be ashes; and our spirit shall be poured abroad as soft air; and our life shall pass away as the trace of a cloud, and shall be dispersed as a mist, which is driven away by the beams of the sun, and overpowered with the heat thereof: and our name in time shall be forgotten: and no man shall have any remembrance of our works. For our time is as the passing of a shadow; and there is no going back of our end: for it is fast sealed, and no man returneth. Come, therefore, and let us enjoy the good things that are present, and let us speedily use the creatures as in youth. Let us fill ourselves with costly wine, and ointments: and let not the flower of the time pass us. Let us crown ourselves with roses, before they be withered: let no meadow escape our riot. Let none of us go without his part in luxury: let us everywhere leave tokens of joy: for this is our portion, and this our lot. Let us oppress the poor just man, and not spare the widow, nor honour the ancient gray hairs of the aged. But let our strength be the law of justice: for that which is feeble is found to be nothing worth. Let us, therefore, lie in wait for the just; because he is not for our turn; and he is contrary to our doings, and upbraideth us with the transgressions of the law, and divulgeth against us the sins of our way of life. He boasteth that he hath the knowledge of God, and calleth himself the son of God. He is become a censurer of our thoughts. He is grievous unto us, even to behold: for his life is not like other men's, and his ways are very different. We are esteemed by him as triflers; and he abstaineth from our ways as from filthiness; and he preferreth the latter end of the just, and glorieth that he hath God for his father." (*Wisdom*, ii. 1—16.)

But the day of judgment arrived and we beheld the just approach to the throne with great constancy--and groaning in anguish of spirit we said, "These are they, whom we had sometime in derision, and for

a parable of reproach. We fools esteemed their life madness, and their end without honour. Behold, how they are numbered among the children of God, and their lot is among the saints. Therefore we have erred from the way of truth: and the light of justice hath not shined unto us; and the sun of understanding hath not risen upon us. We wearied ourselves in the way of iniquity and destruction, and have walked through hard ways: but the way of the Lord we have not known. What hath pride profited us; or what advantage hath the boasting of riches brought us? All those things are passed away like a post that runneth on." (*Wisdom*, v. 3—9.) "But the souls of the just are in the hand of God; and the torment of death shall not touch them. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die: and their departure was taken for misery: and their going away from us, for utter destruction: but they are in peace. And though in the sight of men they suffered torments, their hope is full of immortality. Afflicted in a few things, in many they shall be well rewarded: because God hath tried them, and found them worthy of himself. As gold in the furnace he hath proved them; and as a victim of a holocaust, he hath received them; and in time there shall be respect had to them. The just shall shine, and shall run to and fro like sparks among the reeds. They shall judge nations, and rule over people; and their Lord shall reign for ever. They that trust in him, shall understand the truth: and they that are faithful in love shall rest in him: for grace and peace is to his elect. But the wicked shall be punished according to their own devices: who have neglected the just, and have revolted from the Lord. For he that rejected wisdom and discipline, is unhappy: and their hope is vain, and their labours without fruit: and their works unprofitable." (*Wisdom*, iii. 5—11.)

Will you, brethren, be deaf to those solemn admonitions of revelation? Bring to your mind the fruitless lamentations of the rich glutten in hell. Believe us, dearly beloved brethren, when we open the sacred page and assure you that the wages of sin are eternal death. And oh! why will you die with the means of relief before you?—You are still under the dominion of your passions. Let us ask you in the words of the apostle, what fruit have you now of those things for which you are ashamed? The God whom we serve hath frequently borne our neglect with patience. But he hath also at times sent his angel to fly through the midst of the heavens, like the eagle in the Apocalypse, denouncing multiplied wo to a sinful generation;—and this angel with his right foot on the sea and his left upon the land, having dominion over both, lifted his hand to heaven and swore by

him who liveth for ever and ever, who created heaven, and the things which are therein: and the earth, and the things that are therein: and the sea, and the things that are therein. That to a perverse generation, the time of repentance so often proffered and so often rejected, should be given no more. Then came forth the ministers of vegeance, raging war upon his fiery steed: cruel famine upon his black horse, and death with the pestilence of hell. The just and the unjust were alike trodden down in their merciless career,—but they who had the bloody seal of the Lamb upon their foreheads were protected from the fury of the eternal destroyer: and though their bodies were undistinguishable upon earth, the prison of the unjust was separated by a mighty chaos from the paradise of Heaven. Oh! my brethren, let us reflect, that although the iniquities of a people thus frequently provoke the early exhibition of vegeance; and that the scourging of nations, has been exhibited to our view, still the secret judgments of God are more to be dreaded. We have sinned. Yes, O Lord, we have sinned, convert us to thee: and we shall be converted! Do, my brethren, let us flee from the wrath which is to come—"At their presence the earth hath trembled, the heavens are moved: the sun and moon are darkened: and the stars have withdrawn their shining. And the Lord hath uttered his voice before the face of his army: for his armies are exceeding great, for they are strong, and execute his word: for the day of the Lord is great and very terrible: and who can stand it? Now therefore saith the Lord: be converted to me with all your heart, in fasting, in weeping, and in mourning. And rend your hearts, and not your garments, and turn to the Lord your God: for he is gracious and merciful, patient and rich in mercy, and ready to repent of the evil. Who knoweth but he will return, and forgive and leave a blessing behind him, sacrifice and libation to the Lord your God? Blow the trumpet in Sion; sanctify a fast; call a solemn assembly, gather together the people; sanctify the church; assemble the ancients; gather together the little ones, and them that suck at the breast: let the bridegroom go forth from his bed, and the bride out of her bride-chamber. Between the porch and the altar the priests the Lord's ministers shall weep, and shall say: Spare O Lord, spare thy people: and give not thy inheritance to reproach, that the heathens should rule over them. Why should they say among the nations: Where is thy God? The Lord hath been zealous for his land, and hath spared his people." (*Joel*, chap. ii., v. 10 to v. 18.)

He hath spared us hitherto, although we have been ungrateful. Let us now profit by the mercy which he extends. Let us have recourse

to the sacraments, and perform the holy exercises of the Jubilee. We shall conclude, unworthy as we are, in the words of the Apostle: "For the rest, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are modest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are holy, whatsoever things are amiable, whatsoever things are of good repute, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise of discipline, think on these things. The things which you have both learned and received, and heard and seen in me, these do ye: and the God of peace shall be with you. And the peace of God, which surpasseth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in Christ Jesus." (*Philippians,* chap. iv., vv. 8, 9, and 7.)

Given at Charleston, on the 5th day of November, 1826, being the Sunday within the octave of All Saints.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By the Bishop.

J. F. O'NEIL, *Secretary.*

Conditions to be fulfilled. In order to obtain the benefit of the Indulgence of the Jubilee, at present, in the city of Charleston.

1. To make a good confession and communion.

2. To visit at least four times within the space of one week, at any time of the day which may be most convenient, each of the following three altars, viz., that of the church of Hassell Street, the large altar at the cathedral, and the small altar at the cathedral, repeating at each of them, at least, the Lord's prayer and the Hail Mary, each five times, and the creed once, at each visit, to beseech God for the conversion of all those who are in error of faith, or in habits of immorality, and that he would vouchsafe to enlighten the understandings of men to see truth, and incline their hearts to its belief, and to reduce its principle to practice.

3. To attend during the said week at least at three masses and three instructions, in Hassell Street church; or if there is a serious obstacle to prevent attendance at the Mass, either the five decades of the Rosary, or the Litany of Saints may be substituted therefor.

4. In any special case in which, through sickness or infirmity or other reasonable cause, it will not be in the power of the person desirous of obtaining the benefit of the Indulgence to comply with either of the conditions No. 2, or No. 3, the confessor is empowered to substitute some other condition which may be performed.

Order of Proceeding Daily.—Meditation read after morning prayer, which prayer shall commence at six o'clock:—Mass at seven o'clock.

Ten o'clock, Mass and exhortation.

Half-past six o'clock. P. M. short prayer, short instruction, longer prayer and sermon, after which will be a hymn and music.

These exercises to continue during this week.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

November 5, 1826.

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE DEATH OF POPE LEO XII

John England, by the grace of God and with the approbation of the Holy and Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved, the clergy and laity of our flock, in the diocess of Charleston, health and blessing.

Beloved Brethren:—It is with feelings of sincere grief that we announce to you the death of our late holy father, Pope Leo XII., who departed from this world of trials and probation, at Rome, on the tenth day of last February, to receive, we humbly trust, through the merits of our blessed Saviour, the recompense of his virtues and labours. Of this event, you must have been long since informed, through other channels, whilst we, occupied in the duties of our visitation, were unable to make the necessary arrangements for performing those sacred offices which justice, charity, and religion demanded we should have celebrated for one holding his sacred station and discharging its awful and important duties with so much humility, firmness, and zeal, as did our late venerable Pontiff.

Amongst the earliest, most extended, and best preserved customs of those who, in the first days of the world followed the traditions of the patriarchs, originally derived from God to them, was that which exhibited men supplicating the mercy of the eternal Judge on behalf of their departed brethren. From the land of Armenia it has been transmitted to almost every region of the globe. When the God of Sinai superadded the Levitical rites to the ancient doctrines, the sacrifices of the law were offered for the deceased children of Abraham, and it was acknowledged to be a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they might be loosed from sins. When the desired of nations appeared amongst the children of men, he came not to destroy, but to fulfil; he came to substitute the substance for the shadow, to remove the type and to leave in its place the reality; he came not to contradict the ancient doctrines but to strengthen their evidence, and to make their application manifest. The Apostles imbibed his lessons, received his commission, were confirmed and proclaimed by the

Holy Ghost, and, with the evidence of miracles, they promulgated the revelations of Heaven. They went forth in the might of the Lord conquering and to conquer, wielding, with irresistible effect, the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, and planting the standard of the cross upon the ruins of idolatry, whilst the beauty of holiness shed its pure rays upon those who sat in darkness and in the shadow of death. The commission with which they were invested was to endure all days, even to the consummation of the world. Thus, they and their successors were to be the witnesses of the doctrines of the Lord Jesus to all nations, from the river Jordan to the end of the earth. From them have we received the testimony which we preserve and the practices to which we adhere.

Led by affection and by religion, following the voice of nature and of God, we kneel before our altars, we offer the holy sacrifice, and we pour forth our private supplications before our Father who seeth and heareth in secret, that He would accept our intercession, and yet more fully apply the merits of Him by whose bruises we are healed, to those whose day of labour has closed, but against whom, though saved from eternal ruin, still, because of human imperfection or unsatisfied temporal punishment, something may remain to be purged away. How do the tenets of religion nourish whilst they purify and restrain and guide to a proper course the best affections of the heart? Beloved brethren! what a source of pure and ecstatic consolation to the living is this fountain which bears refreshment and healing to the dead! Well may we exclaim, "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord!" Thus, piety suggested that the remains of our brethren should be laid up around the churches in which we worship, that the very monuments which attachment might raise to their memory, or those mounds to which the eye is irresistibly drawn, should bring back to our view those to whom we were bound by the ties of nature or of religion, and excite our charity to supplicate for them in those moments when the soul, elevated above the transitory things of earth, communes with the God of Heaven.

If they who are placed on high are to be judged more severely; if from those to whose care much is committed, much will be required, how great is the accountability of the visible head of Christ's church on earth, the pastor of pastors, the successor of Peter, to whom was entrusted the charge not only of the lambs, but of the very sheep from which those lambs derive their sustenance? If angels have not been found pure and perfect before the eye of the Eternal, how much less the children of men, who dwell in habitations of clay? If St.

Paul charges the flock to repay the care of the prelates who watch, as being to render an account of their souls, shall we not, in the spirit of his injunction, make supplication on behalf of our departed father, whilst we cherish and honour his memory? Yes, that memory which is deservedly in benediction amongst us?

For this purpose we have regulated, first—That on Friday, the 22d day of this present month of May, a solemn office, High Mass and obsequies be performed for the repose of the soul of our late Pope Leo XII. in our cathedral, the office to commence at ten o'clock, A. M.

Secondly—That in each other church of this diocess, the pastor or other officiating priest shall, as soon as convenient, offer up a public Mass for the same intention.

Thirdly—That such of the faithful as can make it convenient do attend on these occasions, habited as befits the solemn occasion.

Fourthly—We request the faithful, in their private prayers, to make supplication to God to the same intention.

What a picture is presented to the mind in contemplating the history of our church? The ascent to the seat of Peter was, during nearly three centuries, the approach to the crown of martyrdom; the mysterious keys were seldom placed in the hands of one who was not already ripe for heaven; and the mistaken persecutor bestowed the palm of victory upon the venerable pontiff, whom he imagined he had overcome. The force and wiles of heresy next assailed this constancy of their faith. The fairest regions of the apostolic churches were filled with desolation. Barbarian infidels subsequently swept Christendom with a besom of destruction. Civil tumult succeeded to those wars in which was wielded the scourge of God, and things sacred and profane were mingled and equally disregarded in the horrid fray. Despots afterwards endeavoured to wrest the crozier from the hands of those illustrious Popes who refused to become the sycophants of the unprincipled, and the instruments of the ambitious. At length corruption seized upon the very citadel of the church, and abashed religion wept and hung her head, whilst the very profligate disgraced the chair of sanctity, and, with polluted lips, proclaimed the praises of the pure God: but she told her children that, although the scribes and pharisees had set in the chair of Moses, the Saviour had commanded respect for their authority, whilst he warned against their mischievous example; and she was speedily cheered by the divine assurance that she should not be put to shame. In a moment of indignation her spouse had hidden his face, but he had sworn not to be angry with her; his mercy should not depart from her, and the cove-

nant of his peace should not be moved; though she had suffered, she heard his soothing, "Poor little one, tossed with tempest and without all comfort, behold I will lay the stones in order, and will lay thy foundations with sapphires." The days of crime and of schism have passed away, the Lord hath raised up high priests who have emulated the virtues and the information of their most illustrious predecessors: and under their fostering care upwards of one hundred and fifty millions of his Christian people, of all tribes and nations, and tongues have long continued to be one fold under one shepherd.

Eighteen hundred revolving years have exhibited the vicissitudes of human institutions; empires have risen and crumbled to ruin, kingdoms have been created and destroyed, republics have flourished and decayed, warriors have depopulated regions that have become again fruitful; arts have been lost and restored, literature has decayed and revived; but the old establishments and institutions have been consigned to oblivion, all the substitutes are new; forests and lakes occupy the sites of ancient cities, whilst the marsh and the mountain solitude have heard the tumult of the busy dwellings of men. All those things are new. The institution of the Saviour alone is ancient; the rock placed by the eternal hand remains unmoved, in the midst of the ocean of human affairs: lashed by every wave which succeeding tempests hurry along to be dissipated against its side, it is cleansed and polished, but not worn by the succession of billows. The Lord declared to Peter that the power of the adversary should never prevail. The heavens and the earth may pass away, but his word will never fail.

Thus, brethren, we know that, however the church might be, for a time, afflicted by an unworthy pastor, still she will be upheld by that power which ordained that she should continue. But to us it would be an additional consolation, and a substantial blessing that the successor of Leo XII. should inherit his virtue as well as his authority. Let us then fervently pray for this blessing, and may we obtain that and all others which we need, from our heavenly Father, through the merits of our blessed Saviour Jesus Christ.

Given at Charleston, this 12th day of May, in the year of our Lord, 1829.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By order of the Bishop.

JOHN BARRY, *Secretary.*

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE ELECTION OF POPE PIUS VIII

John England, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy and Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved brethren, the clergy and laity of our flock, health and blessing—grace be to you, and peace from God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost.

Beloved Brethren:—We have not long since called upon you to weep over the tomb of our departed father the late venerable Pope Leo XII., and to offer your suffrages to heaven on his behalf: and you have responded to our call. We then also pointed to the chair of Peter which was vacant, and besought you to ask from the Father of mercies and the God of all consolation, that he would raise up for his people a good shepherd under whose guidance they might walk in the paths of truth, of justice, and of salvation. We now communicate to you with joyful heart the glad tidings that a father hath risen up amongst us, and the body of the faithful on earth recognizes in Pius VIII. the commission originally granted to Peter, and derived through his successors to the present visible head of our church.

On the 2d of April, the votes of the sacred College of Cardinals, representing the three hierarchical bodies of the church, have elected to this awful and dignified and holy office Cardinal Castiglione, long known as a man of solid piety, extensive knowledge, deep erudition and well-regulated judgment: approved in the discharge of many and important duties under preceding pontiffs; by the two latter of whom he was held in special esteem.

Whilst we then recognise his jurisdiction, let us give thanks to our God for all his mercies; but especially for this, that so important an election has been wrought by his goodness, in so much peace and harmony, to so desirable a result.—For this purpose, therefore, we direct. 1st. That a solemn hymn and prayer of thanks be offered in our cathedral on Sunday the 28th inst., immediately after the high Mass—and at the other church in this city immediately after the evening service of the same day. 2d. That the name of our holy father, Pius VIII. be forthwith inserted and used in the proper place in the canon of the Mass and the other public offices within this diocess. 3dly, That a proper thanksgiving be made in each other church in the diocess upon the first convenient day to be named by the respective pastors, after they shall have read this letter. 4thly, That the faithful do offer their prayers to God, to obtain his grace and aid to our new chief pastor in the discharge of his high and important duties.

May the grace and blessing of God remain with you, and preserve you.

Given at Charleston, in South Carolina, on the 17th day of June, in the year of our Lord, 1829.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By order of the Bishop.

JOHN BARRY, *Secretary.*

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE ELECTION OF POPE GREGORY XVI

John England, by the grace of God, and with the approbation of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston.

To our beloved brethren, the clergy, and our beloved children in Christ, the Roman Catholic laity of the diocess of Charleston, health and blessing.

Reverend Brethren and Beloved Children:—It is with peculiar feelings of gratification that we announce to you the result of the conclave which followed the decease of our late holy father Pius VIII. of respected memory. On the first day of February, Cardinal Mauro Cappellari, was duly elected, and assumed the name of Gregory XVI.

The distinguished virtue, the enlightened zeal, the consummate prudence, the unimpeachable integrity of the sacred and venerable body of electors, gave to us, from the beginning, perfect security that we should behold raised to the dignity of vicar of Jesus Christ, one worthy of the long line of sages and of saints who, with remarkably few exceptions, have filled the papal chair. When we cast our eyes upon those men from amongst whom the selection was probably to be made, we could not discern even one, against whom calumny itself had dared to whisper an insinuation of crime. Thus though, upon a few occasions, the inscrutable providence of God permitted, for his own wise purposes, that contamination should reach the very shrine of the sanctuary, we could perceive no danger at the present period that Christendom should be scandalized, even though by that very scandal it should be proved, that the profligacy of the pontiff could not destroy the institution of Heaven; and that the vices of the man should not make void the promises of Christ.—No! beloved—it has been indeed our privilege to live in that day when we can, with confidence, marshal the eminent and venerable chieftains of the holy city in the presence of an observing and a scrutinizing world, and in their name repeat, with humility, the words of their divine Saviour, "which of you can convict me of sin?" Not

that they can claim any inherent natural sanctity, as of themselves or from themselves; for what they are, that they are, not by their natural strength, but by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; nor would we insinuate that they are exempt from those imperfections and frailties which are the inheritance of our common nature, and by which we all transgress; but that they exhibit in their aggregate as bright and as perfect a constellation of the Christian virtues as may be found in the same number of individuals of the human family, collected together in any time or place.

This has been to us indeed a most consoling and cheering reflection, and besides the special promise to the Saviour to his spouse, that he would uphold and protect her: we had also great reliance upon those circumstances themselves in those days of trial and difficulty, when kings and nations, when infidelity and error appear to have banded themselves together, for the destruction of the church. These indeed are days of strange revolutions, of vast and sudden changes, of usurpations of rights and struggles for their protection, of awful preparation, and of rumours of wars. The extraordinary aspect of such times rendered the choice of a successor for St. Peter a subject of more than usual importance; because not only was the Holy See already deeply involved in the concerns of some potentates and states which had endeavoured to usurp her rights, but there was every prospect of increased and more extended difficulties. To us, therefore, it could be no matter of surprise that the election was preceded by very mature deliberation. There was question of selecting a proper head for superintending the spiritual and ecclesiastical concerns of a body of one hundred and eighty millions of people, of all tongues and tribes and nations, formed into one fold of which this chief was to be the shepherd,—besides his having a tender and affectionate concern for those who had been yeaned in the desert into which their parents had unfortunately strayed. To him also it belongs to use his best efforts to cause the tidings of salvation to be conveyed to the gentile world; and to bring the remnant of the children of Israel to be subject to the spiritual rule of that Prince of peace who came to them in his meekness seated upon the colt of the ass that bore the yoke. How great the dignity! How awful the responsibility! And so far as we can observe, the selection has been indeed most prudent and fortunate.

Cardinal Cappellari had for some time filled the office of prefect of the Congregation of Cardinals, for the propagation of the faith. This is one of those stations which requires the union of several most rare and useful qualities, and it was from this he was elevated to the

apostolic chair. The peculiar nature of his former office brought him into frequent and extensive correspondence with the church of the United States, and renders him intimately acquainted with all our concerns. He has uniformly taken a deep interest in our welfare; and therefore whilst we rejoice in observing the benefit which is likely to accrue to the universal church from his elevation, we find it peculiarly acceptable to ourselves.

Let us, then, give thanks to our Lord for all his mercies, and let us specially render to him our gratitude for the blessing vouchsafed in the results of the last conclave, and for the happy union that exists in the household of the faith. Let us assiduously pray for the continuance of that good of which we are made partakers; let us humbly intreat that he who called our venerable father to his awful station, would preserve him in his grace, would enlighten him with the spirit of wisdom, would fill him with discreet zeal, would sustain him in calm fortitude, would animate him with courage to lead the hosts of the Lord to the discomfiture of vice, and the overthrow of the prince of darkness, so that under his guidance the ark of our faith may be borne in safety whilst the surrounding multitude, decorated with virtue, advance to the true land of their inheritance, following that cloud of holy witnesses that has preceded, where the angel of the Lord marks the way.

Critical, indeed, is the situation of him who, in the midst of the present difficulties of times and circumstances, undertakes the government of the church; and unless he be sustained by the power of God, he must experience disappointment. Do, then, I again intreat you, be constant in your prayers on his behalf, for he watches as being to render an account of our souls.

How wonderful and how singular is the spectacle which presents itself to us, when contemplating the continuance of the Holy See! It is that rock placed by an almighty hand in the midst of the ocean of time, that it might sustain the edifice of his church. The fragments of human institutions are scattered around: kingdoms, empires, republics, and nations have arisen, grown old, been scattered, decayed and are forgotten; and yet this rock with its edifice remains. The monuments of the mighty are sought after in vain, whilst the seat upon which Jesus Christ placed the poor Galilean fisherman continues unmoved and conspicuous; so that you might as soon pluck the sun from the firmanent, as this see from the earth. During eighteen centuries how many billows have swelled and threatened to overwhelm it? Howling, they rose and seemed to overtop it, they were broken upon its front; they

swept the impurities from its sides, the divided mass of waters foamed round its base, murmured as it passed along and was soon unnoticeable in the distance. The Arian, the Nestorian, the Eutychian, the Montanist, the Novatian, the Donatist, the Iconoclast, and hundreds of others, have shared this fate; but others have succeeded, and when they too shall have have run their course, others will follow; whilst the inmates of the edifice, may look abroad, like the favoured few from the ark, and feel conscious of security in the midst of the mighty deluge, because the word of heaven is the pledge of their safety.

To this have all the great saints and doctors of the early ages adhered; from this have the great apostles of the world gone forth; in this have the several families, and tribes, and tongues, and nations of Christendom been united; in this have the seeds and germs of civilization and literature been preserved, when ruthless barbarians devastated the fairest provinces of the church. Here has piety relumed her torch, and carried thence the sacred flame to rekindle holy fervour. Venerable for its antiquity, sacred for its religion, majestic in its literature, calumniated for its unchanging fidelity to the institutions of the Saviour, let us adhere to it with tenacious devotion, "for there the Apostles poured out their whole doctrine with their blood." and there Peter yet speaks with the voice of Gregory, and in adhering to Peter we obey Jesus Christ.

We, therefore, direct, 1st, That, from the receipt of these presents, the name of Gregory XVI. be introduced in the public prayers and in the canon of the Mass, in its proper place as Pope, throughout the diocess of Charleston.

2. That this our letter be published and read by each priest of this diocess for his congregation, on the first Sunday after he shall have received the same and met the congregation.

3. That in every church of the diocess a suitable form of thanksgiving and prayer for the Pope be used, according to the convenience of that church, on as early a day as may be.

We pray that God would bestow upon you every blessing, and preserve you in his holy service; pray also for us, reverend brethren and beloved children in Christ.

Given, upon our visitation, at Augusta, in Georgia, on this nineteenth day of April, in the year of our Lord, 1831.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By order of the bishop,

PETER WHELAN, *Secretary.*

LETTER ON CIVIC AND POLITICAL DUTIES TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CITIZENS OF CHARLESTON

Beloved Friends and Brethren:—After much anxious reflection, I have thought it my duty, to address to you my advice and exhortation, upon what I consider and trust you will feel to be a very momentous subject: one in which the highest and the holiest duties of private and public morality are deeply involved, and consequently, one in which religion has a peculiar and essential concern. I had more than once determined to address you, in church, upon the topics of this letter; but I was dissuaded, by the recollection of the way in which on more than one occasion, I was represented as having used my ministry for political purposes when I was perfectly conscious that, whatever might have been the impression upon the minds of others, such was by no means the fact. I therefore feared that should I, under the present circumstances, preach upon this subject, a variety of inconveniences might follow, which will, I trust, be obviated by my addressing to you a printed admonition, which may be thoroughly and repeatedly examined by any person who pleases.

My object is to address you upon your duties as civic or political electors; and if any expression shall escape me, which may appear to interfere with your unquestionable right of due investigation, free choice, uncontrolled action, as well in fairly influencing those who may differ from you, as in honestly promoting the just views of the party, you may upon principle espouse, I intreat of you to believe me, that it has escaped without my observation; and I beg of you to consider it as retracted. I neither possess, nor do I claim, nor ought you to concede to me, either as your pastor, or as your fellow-citizen, any greater power in this respect, than what I derive from the constitutions and laws of this state and of the United States, for I could not derive such power from any other source; and from that I derive no more than is possesed by my humblest fellow-citizen. I am aware that in the great and too general ignorance which prevails regarding our tenets, and our practices, very strange and unfounded notions on this head, exist in the minds of large masses of our fellow-citizens. You, however, know your own rights in this regard; I trust that I always have respected them, and that I shall continue that respect.

But though I have neither right nor inclination to interfere in the direction of your mere civic or political concerns, beyond what I have here stated, yet the obligation lies heavily upon me of taking a decided part, and exercising the authority with which, however unworthy, I am invested, in those things which concern your religious or your moral duties; and it is under a deep sense of that obligation that I now come forward. But though I had no such obligation; were there no question of what God demanded of you; upon such an occasion, I would be induced by the interest, deep and affectionate and tender, which I must naturally feel in all that involves your peace, your credit, your respectability, your honour, either as a body or as individuals. I trust, therefore, that this address will not by you be considered as uncalled for, officious, or intermeddling. Others may, for their own purposes, soothe you with more sweet and honeyed words, they may flatter your spirit of independence, they may steal upon your affections, by expressing deep sympathy for your wrongs and devotion to your interest; they may inspire your energies, by touching chords to which your enthusiasm would instinctively vibrate a response. But I ask you with confidence; Do they love you better? Have they for you made so many, I will not call them, sacrifices? Are they equally prepared and devoted, as is he who addresses you, to labour for your advantage, to promote your welfare, to study how your interests may be furthered, to stand by you in the day of trial, to console you on the bed of sickness, to adhere to you with a "desperate fidelity," "through good and through evil report," and to be equally exposed in your front, whether you are held forth to derision, or marked out for assault?

Allow me then to address you, in the spirit of affection, upon a subject in which your credit and mine, your honour and mine, for whatever affects you must affect me, upon a subject in which the credit of our church, the interest of your souls, the honour and glory of the eternal God are concerned.

A period of election approaches; the excitement is absorbing: whatever may be the isolated value of the candidates, the deepest interest is felt in the result. I need not inform you that preparations have been long made by each of the two large parties into which we are unfortunately divided, to use these and all such occasions, as means to strengthen itself, and to weaken its opponent. It is not a mere struggle for place, but it is a contest for principle; a contest in which the most splendid minds, the most eloquent tongues, the most practised statesmen, and I believe conscientiously, the purest patriots are, I fear, irreconcilably opposed. If I view it correctly, it is upon a question of

fearful magnitude, involving mighty and extensive consequences; and one which has during upwards of forty years employed the attention, and elicited the discussions of the finest and most erudite minds that our states have produced, but which has now taken such an appearance as calls for a determination. This is a question you will acknowledge, the infallibly correct decision of which it would be rashness for the greater number of our citizens individually to assume. Each of us, however, is not only entitled, but indeed obliged to give it his deep reflection, and to seek for the best means of forming a correct opinion, by which he should be guided in giving his vote; and though each citizen might not be fully able to grasp the whole subject, and though several might form very erroneous notions, and vote accordingly, I would say that if the individuals acted honestly, according to their impressions, those votes were fairly and properly given, and they also who gave them acted morally and religiously. In like manner would I say, that each person who had formed an opinion for himself, was fully justified in using all the powers of argument to convert others to his views, and even those of pure solicitation, to influence persons who wavered or hesitated. Were the efforts of party confined within these limits, I should not have thus addressed you.

What has been at all times the state of a free society convulsed by party spirit, is exactly at present ours. I need not describe what you behold! They who have enlisted under the banners of one division, lose all charity for those who are ranged under the standard of the other: when argument has been exhausted, ridicule and reproach are resorted to; the worst motives are imputed; suspicions are incautiously admitted: the mind brooding over these, fancies they receive support from indifferent circumstances, which at other times would excite the smile of reason, or the indignation of friendship; what was first only a surmise, is now considered to be a certainty: the gravest charges are made upon the slightest grounds; the denial given by conscious integrity is construed into an offence; and whilst the demons of pride, of envy, of revenge, and hundreds of such imps excite the mind of citizen against citizen, of brother against brother, we, vaunting of our prowess, and hurling accusations, threats, and defiance at each other, all our kindliest intercourse destroyed, the very bonds of our society snapped asunder, our industry impeded, our energies wasted or perverted, are impoverished at home, we are ridiculed abroad: and whilst good men weep, and pitying angels would mediate our reconciliation, hell triumphs in its own success, and adds to its efforts to increase our dissensions.

It is at such a moment as this, when every moral restraint is cast away, when every bond of religion is disregarded: when party spirit assumes the semblance of patriotism, when ambition, defeated and mortified, but not subdued, goes forth in the guise of disinterested independence, accompanied by bland intrigue, and ready to attain his object at any price: it is at such a moment as this, that it becomes the duty of the minister of religion, of the guardian of morality, by how many imperfections soever he may himself be covered, to come forward and to interfere; and it is therefore that I address you.

I caution you not to apply to either party exclusively, nor to any individuals of either what I have written; it is designed by me as a general description of the unfortunate consequences of our state of excitement, and not as specifically characteristic of a party; nor can I admit that any expression of it should be taken as alluding to any individual. Neither let it be said that I have cast obloquy upon Charleston, or disparaged South Carolina. Such has not been my intention, nor have I been so guilty. Yet, if I did think that either the city or the state deserved to be held forth as fallen from their proper places, and that my duty required the exhibition, I trust I would fearlessly make it; though with a weeping eye, a downcast head, and an afflicted heart.

I charge nothing upon my fellow-citizens but the common frailties of our common nature; and from these they neither have received, nor do they plead an exemption. There is no nation under heaven, there is no city on earth, in which the same result would not flow from the same causes that exist among us. We are peculiarly circumstanced, and the temptations against which I would caution you arise from that peculiarity. So far from being disposed to disparage this state, I would be ungrateful if it had not my affections, and unjust if it had not my esteem, and should I cast obloquy on our city, it would be not only ungrateful and unjust to our fellow-citizens, but it would be insulting to you, and injurious as regards myself.

When I have, therefore, endeavoured faintly to describe what are everywhere the consequences of party spirit under great excitement; and asserted the obligation of the pastors of the church to guard against their results: I only desired to justify myself for what might otherwise appear to be an impertinent intrusion. And if I address myself solely to you, and not to the citizens generally; it is not because I look upon you as more exposed to the temptations or more liable to yield to their influence, but because I am your pastor, and hold thus towards you, a relation in which I do not stand toward them. Let it not, therefore,

be supposed that because you are the particular objects of my solicitude, I regard you as less worthy citizens, or more exposed to be corrupted or misled. They cannot be better citizens or members of society than I would desire; but I am bound to use my best efforts to make you better: you have expressed not only your consent but your request to that effect, by adhering to me as your bishop. They disavow any such relation between us. It would on my part, be an unwarranted assumption therefore, thus to address them; and were I so arrogant, I must expect their rebuke. But you are identified with me and I with you; I advise you then, to guard against the temptations by which you are surrounded, not because I think you stand in more need of the admonition, but because my duty demands it, and my affection acquiesces in the demand.

There is nothing in the present contest which directly or indirectly affects, either our faith, our discipline, or our religious freedom; and therefore, nothing which could warrant me, even by implication, in its present shape, to enlist your religious feelings on either one side or the other. By your religious obligation as Christians, you are bound to adhere to, and to uphold your regularly constituted government, whatever might be its form, in the full exercise of all its legitimate powers, and by your resistance to its legitimate exercise of authority, you would, in the violation of the first principles of society, violate one of the fundamental maxims of morality, and by resisting the ordinance of God, you would, as the Apostle St. Paul says, purchase damnation for yourself. This contest at present wears the aspect of a discussion to ascertain whether our general government has acted unconstitutionally; and if so, whether either our state government or the state itself, has power to use a certain process to restrain the usurpation; and to this is added another question, in which morality and religion are also deeply concerned, which is, whether supposing the usurpation of power by the general government, and the want of such a restraining power in our state or its government, the period has arrived when allegiance is no longer due to the usurping power; and that we are in the sight of heaven and before God, in conscience, fully absolved from the obligation of that allegiance which has been imposed upon us by our birth or by our adoption, and sanctioned by our solemn oaths. These are serious and important questions, which require solemn deliberation, and whose solution may involve terrific consequences. I put it to you, my friends and fellow-citizens, and beloved children in Christ,—Do you think you can safely answer to God and to your consciences, and to your country, to your children, and to future generations, if upon such ques-

tions as these you act from a spirit of rash pride or human affection? These questions perplex the minds of the wisest statesmen, they are to be decided not by the clamour of popular assemblies, not in the midst of carousals and excitement, not by mere physical force or brute violence. No—this is not the spirit of civilized nations, of organized societies; above all—surely, we will not admit that it is the American mode of prudently disposing of the deepest, the most delicate question that can arise regarding the nature of our own institutions. There must be some constitutional mode for their decision, or else our system is singularly and fatally defective, and ought to be amended. These are not ecclesiastical or religious questions; but if the constitutional authority to expound them were clearly ascertained, religion would repeat the divine precept, that all should submit to its power, and uphold its authority. The individual who addresses you has formed, for his own direction, an opinion upon this subject, to which he means to adhere, until he shall see very powerful reason to depart from it; he cannot be infallibly certain of its correctness; he admits, to every one of his fellow-citizens the same right to form and to act upon his own opinion; but he would entreat and beseech them and in the name of God, and by his authority, he admonishes them, not to dispute acrimoniously with their brethren who form opinions different from theirs, not to attribute to them improper motives, not to charge them with entertaining designs which they disavow; and above all, not to use unkind, reproachful or contumelious expressions. If they feel themselves excited or if they perceive their brethren becoming warm or irritated, though the conversation had given no sufficient cause for it, in their opinion, let them change the topic of discourse or be silent; for even information is too dearly purchased at the price of charity. He would be therefore understood as above all things inculcating moderation and charity: and they are perfectly compatible with the most decided and vigorous assertion of public and private rights.

It too frequently happens that in the collision of parties, the obligation of the citizen is overlooked or forgotten, and the worst passion usurps the place of patriotic zeal. It is therefore well to revert to those obligations. I shall not refer specially to the approved authors and admitted authorities by whom I am sustained in the condensed view that I lay before you. Independently of their authority, the reason of the positions themselves will, I trust, be manifest.

In entering into society every man parts with a large portion of his natural rights, as the price for social happiness and protection; it would be then equally absurd and unjust on his part, to build up claims

for himself upon what he has thus given away for an equivalent. In the social state every individual, impliedly, yet unquestionably, has made two contracts; the first with each of the other individuals of whom that society is composed, and from which there arises a reciprocal obligation upon all the members, to abstain from what would be injurious, to do that which would be beneficial: and to reduce this to practice, that each will in their common concerns be guided by the general will; sacrificing thereto their individual opinions. To express this general will, they agree upon a form of government, and regulate the extent of its powers: this agreement may be considered their constitutional decree. This government must be carried on by individuals acting by the authority and in the name of the whole body, and using the powers with which it has been invested, for the object of its creation, that is, for the good of the body at large. Each individual then makes a new contract with the power thus created, that he will sustain it in the due exercise of its powers, and submit to its lawful regulations, even though, as must frequently happen, his individual and private interests or happiness should be seriously encroached upon, to promote the good of the community. This contract extends even farther, and will always require that in public concerns the individual shall honestly prefer the public good to his private emolument. It is upon this ground that he may be required to present himself to almost certain death for the protection of his country. The ready, cheerful, and conscientious discharge of his duty in fulfilling this part of the contract, is called patriotism, and it is a moral virtue which society honours, and a religious obligation, the fidelity to which, God rewards: but the neglect of which must always be criminal in the sight of heaven. He who has not patriotism is guilty of a violation of his bargain with society; he offends that God who is the author of the social compact, the upholder of order, the remote source of the governmental authority, the witness of the mutual obligations of contracting parties, and the avenger of their violation. He who would claim the benefits of the social compact, but would seek to withdraw himself from its burdens, is guilty of meanness and injustice. He may amongst some, obtain credit for his adroitness, his talent for intrigue, his keenness of observation, and the tact by which he manages and moulds others to his purposes. A man may possess all those and higher qualities, but if he uses them to attain for himself or his friends a monopoly, or an undue share of the benefits, or to exempt himself or them from their proper portion of the inconveniences of the social or civil compact, he is no more a patriot than is any similar knave; his appropriate appellation would be a political swindler; and society

should treat him as such. In nothing is the divine maxim more obligatory than in observing the social compact. And when the Saviour charged us to do to all men, as we would they should do unto us, clearly he did not exempt from its operation that first and most sacred covenant between the citizens and the government. Patriotism is thus a duty of Christian obligation, and its absence is a crime in the estimation of our church.

I acknowledge that the quality is exceedingly rare; like all other Christian virtues, there are, I fear, more hypocrites who cloak themselves in its semblance, than there are sincere lovers of their country who feel its influence. You can test yourselves upon the subject, by calmly examining your conscience, in making the inquiry; whether in the discharge of your public duties you are led by motives of your own private gain, your own private affection, your own private hatred, your attachment to a party, or the love of your country's welfare, prosperity, and honour. Believe me, my dear children in Christ, you will have to account for your conduct upon this head, before the tribunal of God. Your own calm, deliberate, dispassionate view of what, in the presence of Heaven, you think best for the public weal, is to be the rule of your action. You are upon this head, independent of me, independent of the church; but you are accountable to your country, and amenable to your God. You are bound to seek the promotion of the interests of the community at large to which you belong, according to the principles of that constitution under which you live. If you do not, you sin; and though you may escape the responsibility to a human tribunal, which cannot search into the recesses of your heart, yet you will not escape the vengeance of the living God, from whom nothing can be concealed. Do then, beloved, I entreat, I exhort, I command you, by the affection which you bear to Jesus Christ, who gave his blood for your redemption—lay aside every mean, selfish feeling, divest yourselves of the acrimony of party spirit, recollect the obligations which you have contracted with your fellow-citizens, and with your country—the oaths which you have sworn in the face of Heaven, the account which you shall render to your Creator; and laying aside all bitterness, envy, and strife, calmly and deliberately seek for the prosperity and permanence of our excellent constitutions, and the general benefit of the whole community, not only on the present but on every other occasion which requires your exercise of your civic rights.

I will not stoop to argue upon the observation which I know might truly be made, that you are but a few in the midst of a large community, and that if the great body act differently from that mode which

I have pointed out, your taking up those principles would be useless to the country, and injurious to yourselves. Why should you be called upon to forego the private advantages which some must reap, and which others would attain to your exclusion?

I lament that to a certain extent there is much foundation for what has been observed. But, my friends, when I undertook to address you, my object was not to assume the place of the public reformer of the morals of the community, but to discharge the duty which I owed to my own flock. Though you should stand alone, and be singular in your strict fulfilment of your duty, that singularity would be honourable, and though you should reap no temporal benefit, you would save your souls. Look to the miserable and transient advantages which are procured on such occasions, even by the most successful of those who prostitute their principles and traffic for their consciences. See by what a precarious tenure they are held—with what envy and hatred they are accompanied—what a spirit of dissipation follows their acquirement—how they paralyse creditable and industrious habits of exertion. Add to this, the humiliating feeling of dependence in the possessor, and the torturing recollection of the mode by which they have been obtained—and perhaps you will not consider it strange, that to me, who loves your welfare, it has generally been rather a source of consolation than of pain, that you have usually been overlooked in those distributions of places, which are at the same time necessary to our government but dangerous to its purity. But I cannot consent to the admission that the great bulk of our community is corrupt. No, thank God, we have amongst us a large body of pure and honourable patriots, of conscientious and sensible citizens, and men of incorruptible integrity—men who would not be tempted for any consideration, to swerve from the pursuit of the general good, and who are ready to make great sacrifices for its attainment. Take such men for your models; when you stand upon the same level with them, I am ready to declare that you have done your duty as citizens. By acting upon this principle, men whose souls would sicken at the notion of corruption, will be chosen to fill public stations, and the venal and the sycophant will find that their debasement and prostitution will only purchase disgrace and disappointment.

I am free to acknowledge that it gives me deep pain and some fear, that there has been commenced some years since in our city, a system which I shall not describe, but whose effects, whatever might have been its sources, have indeed been to a certain extent, contaminating and disastrous, and which if persevered in, would destroy every semblance

of liberty in a vortex of corruption; but I should hope that they who are suspected as its authors, have the misfortune of innocently bearing the imputation of the nefarious and disgraceful conduct of criminals, who sought to cover the practices which would be most destructive to freedom, with the sanction of the names of those who aspire to lead in its achievement. It is one of the serious inconveniences to which prominent public characters are exposed, that as the price of their station they are too often obliged to submit to public slander, without finding a remedy for the evil.

Whilst therefore I deny that there exists a general corruption in our city, and cherish the hope that the portion which does exist, has no connexion with our prominent and leading fellow-citizens, I would inculcate upon you the obligation of keeping altogether aloof from the intrigues, the cabals, the allurements, the promises, the expectations, and the other corrupting inducements which undoubtedly to a limited extent exist at present among us. You cannot be in any way connected with such sources of evil without being criminal.

On the part of the government there are special obligations, exceedingly onerous and of the utmost importance, and the violation of which involves the guilty in deep moral responsibility. One of the most serious of this description is the distributive justice, by which places of honour, of trust, or of emolument are disposed of. This justice regards as well the public for whose benefit the places are created, as the individuals who claim to fill them. It is a grievous mistake to imagine that they may be disposed of, merely according to the caprice, or for the emolument of the bestower. The power of making such appointments is one of the highest trusts than can be reposed in an individual or a body: the two ends to which public justice demands attention are, first, the efficient discharge of the prescribed duty, and secondly, the due regard to the merits and qualifications of the candidates. The abuse of this power would be not only a violation of the contract with the people, that every effort should be made to attain these ends, but moreover, a high offence to that God by whom society is sanctioned, and government upheld: it is farther criminal in the injustice done to the injured individuals, the depravity of the bad example, the discontent which it creates, the contempt into which it brings the ruling power, and the tendency which it has to destroy society, by driving the people to the sad alternative of a submission to tyranny, or having recourse to the evils of revolution, as less than those of a tame and spiritless acquiescence in the misgovernment. When, in a monarchy, places are thus improperly bestowed, it is called favouritism; when

bribes are taken for the appointments, it is called corruption; and nothing can be more odious, more criminal, or more calculated to destroy public and private morality, and to tear away the foundations upon which the social edifice rests, than such nefarious conduct. I would ask you, my friends, whether the crime is diminished, or the danger to society is removed, by the corrupt influence being found in a body instead of an individual. Suppose in a senate, instead of a monarch? I would say that the latter is the more dangerous, for in the first case there is a sole responsibility, there is an exposure of singleness, which makes the individual feel, that in case of public excitement, he alone is the marked victim of public indignation, and prudence, or cowardice will restrain a depraved but a designated individual; whilst in the body, each particular member becomes lost in the multitude, and calculates upon the impunity of his corruption, in the indistinctness of his exhibition. The most speculating trafficker in that assembly, might be the loudest in denouncing corruption, and in declaiming against the gross delinquency of the body, whilst he affects to lament the impossibility of detecting the depraved individuals.

But if the distribution of offices be, for greater caution, kept for the primary choice of the people—the principle of distributive justice is not altered; and though it is not now in the power of an individual or of a few, to make the appointment, yet it is made by the concurrence of individuals; and each has reposed in him a trust, similar to that of the monarch; thus, each individual elector is subject to all the obligations which we found to exist in the king, or in the senator; and his partial or corrupt use of this power, is clearly a crime in morality and in religion, and produces, as far as that individual is concerned, all the bad consequences which are found in the corruption, the disorganization, and the destruction of the state. It is no excuse for one, to know that others are corrupt; he who to secure to himself a share of the booty joined a gang of highwaymen, whom he knew he could not prevent from committing murder and robbery, might with equal propriety allege their previous power and determination, to excuse his depravity.

Of all the spectacles which are humiliating to the just pride of an honest republican, I know of no one so galling, as to behold his fellow-citizens debased by a paltry bribe to procure the ruin of that distributive justice which alone is the great conservative principle of our free institutions: I know of no being so degraded in the vilest slavery, as the miserable wretch who, wearing the semblance of a freeman, sells the invaluable inheritance of his community entrusted to his guardianship, for such a paltry bribe as forms the wages of such prostitution in

our city. Let no one speak to me of the existence of one principle of religion in such a traitor! He has no love of God. It is an ennobling quality which, decorating the soul, assimilates the inhabitant of earth to the bright and ardent seraph that glows in affection before the eternal throne of the Creator: this love of God is the spirit of religion: it lifts man above the earth, brings him nearer to heaven, and inspires him with the holy ambition of being perfect as his heavenly Father is perfect.—No. Speak not to me of the existence of religion in that fallen and pitiable being, who for such despicable compensation, betrays his conscience, if he have any, to remorse, his country to the ambition of the criminal who purchased him, and his soul to the power of the ministers of divine vengeance.

And can it be possible, that men of high minds, of honourable feelings, of republican principles, of splendid talents, of extensive information, men who would preserve liberty, could stoop to such an abominable traffic as this? I am reluctant to believe it. It is not only grossly criminal, but it involves, necessarily involves the rapid destruction of our liberties. It is not for me to refer to the dreadful catalogue of calamities which history exhibits as the inevitable consequences of such treason. I am told that each party pleads the necessity of doing what it abhors, upon the principle of self-defence. And is it come to this! Are we now made familiar with the open organization of what every one would consider as the grossest insult to charge him with personally procuring? Are our citizens so fallen from their self-respect as to feel no sense of shame in partaking of treats, and of drinks, and of the profits of furnishing them with a most liberal and exorbitant advantage, not to mention the expectations of offices, the prices for proselytes, and the price for votes, and the seductive and debauching allurements to which the partisans are said to have recourse? Cannot men be pointed out in our city well clad, well mounted, and amply furnished with money, who are known to be, notoriously, men of no personal property, but are merely the crimps of either one party or the other? And does any person flatter himself that public or private virtue can be preserved under such circumstances as these? Is not the industrious parent induced to leave his daily occupations, and to forego the social circle of his little family in the evening, leaving his wife deserted, and his children neglected, and his employers disappointed: and is he not brought into the society of the dissipated, the dissolute, the brawlers, and the idle and discontented? Do we not find our city, hitherto, and as yet, thank God, one of the most peaceful and orderly in the universe, beginning to exhibit symptoms of an opposite character? Are we

not now, sometimes disturbed by the party yell—and by the exclamation of the excited, returning at a late hour from their places of meeting? And is all this calculated to uphold the purity of our republican institutions, and the deep and reverential sense of religion? Is this to be the bulwark of our public virtue? My dear brethren, these symptoms present to me anything but the evidence of a love of liberty and an attachment to virtue. And it is therefore, that in my solicitude for your welfare, I have thrust myself forward, careless of the consequences to me personally, to arrest your progress, to entreat of you to reflect, to beseech of you to go aside for a little from the crowd, to place yourselves in the presence of your God, and to ask your conscience—Has your conduct been that of good Catholics, of good republicans?

My object then is to excite you to patriotism, to inculcate charity, to caution you against permitting yourselves to be made the mere passive instruments of any factious or ambitious men, to entreat of you not to be the mere appendages to any party, to induce you to seek for the information by which you should be guided in your civic conduct; not in cabals, or night meetings, but from your own reading and reflection, and the advice of sensible, dispassionate, and prudent men, in whom you think you may place confidence, and from whom you may obtain information. After having thus sought for light, act upon your own honest convictions. This is the independence which I would recommend. Do not mistake ill-manners, obstinacy, turbulence, threats, violence, party spirit, nor any of them, for this noble quality, which is generally accompanied by courtesy, the love of information, meekness, forbearance, and a pacific disposition. The braggart and the bully are generally devoid of moral courage. God forbid that you should bring disgrace upon yourselves, obloquy upon your church, and pain to your friends by thus exhibiting yourselves. Avoid intemperance; it is the bane of every virtue, it is the degradation of the likeness of God below the level of the brute. It not only exposes all your follies, but it makes yourself the herald to publish all your evil propensities; it subjects you to the mockery of children, and to the scoffs of slaves; it destroys your health, it robs you of your respectability, it leaves you worthless to society, a burden to yourself, an affliction to your friends, and makes you an enemy of God, and an outcast from his grace, thus depriving you of heaven. The men who would demoralize you with bribes, would also degrade you by intoxication, and—must I write it?—they, or their minions have recourse to more disgusting profligates, that they may enslave you to your vilest passions, and thus debauch you into their service! And shall it be tolerated that these things shall be done in the

name of liberty? You see wretched beings reeking from such preparation as this, brought up to commit perjury at the polls; thus, after having cast off the last relic of virtue upon earth, driven to abandon the last expectation of mercy from heaven! And this is to be the foundation upon which our liberties are to rest! We thought that even in the midst of such a wreck of morality, we had one protection in the legal punishment of the miserable delinquent; but when an effort was made to sustain ourselves upon it, that also gave way. And whilst the mockery of religion and of public justice inflicted upon the consciences of those who possessed them, the penalty of a solemn oath, before they would be permitted the use of their undoubted right at the polls; they were compelled to witness the profanation of God's holy book, and the blasphemy of his more holy name, by the unfortunate men, who, equally bereft of shame and of conscience, and of virtue, and of franchise, violated the rights of the citizens, and the constitution of the state, and the law of the eternal God, by the procuration of the minions of parties. And when the judge decided that there was no law to punish such flagrant delinquency; is it presumptuous, is it arrogant in a citizen, to entreat of his representatives to inform their constituents, for what cause did they permit this shocking source of crime and insecurity to continue? God forbid that I should insinuate that there existed in any quarter, a disposition to facilitate party support, by permitting such extraordinary impunity. If I am rightly informed, the remedy is in the hands of our city delegation; and no equal number of my individual fellow-citizens possess my more sincere respect; yet they owe us an explanation. You will ask me, my beloved flock, whether I implicate you in these charges. I make the charges upon no individuals—I only put forward what I fear are facts too notorious to be called in question. And I warn you, I exhort you, I entreat, I command you in the name of God, to keep aloof from the contamination. Be not partakers of these things. Can you not determine individually and act individually, without exposing yourselves to such evil communication? Your self-respect as men—your patriotism as citizens—your religion as Catholics—all, all plead strongly against such practices. The end which you propose, you will tell me, is good—you say that you avoid these crimes yourselves, and that you cannot be accountable for the misconduct of your associates. Suppose I allow the end to be the best possible. What are the means? Need I repeat that which has been inculcated upon your minds from your childhood. That virtue consists in seeking to attain a good end by good means—that it is criminal to use good means for a bad purpose, to use bad

means for a good purpose, or to use evil means for an evil end. Have you not always been informed that the morality which we are taught by our divine Redeemer, goes to the extent of forbidding as criminal the least evil, for instance the most trivial lie, even if it were possible thereby to attain the greatest good, even the releasing from hell of every unfortunate being which it contains. Are you not accountable if those abominations are aided by your subscription, by your agency, by your encouragement of the subscribers, or agents, or by the countenance which your presence affords? Extensive and appalling as the evil is, I am convinced that the vast, the overwhelming portion of our constituency, is not only patriotic and pure, but that it holds these practices in the utmost detestation, and would gladly and zealously exert itself to extirpate them. But they have been introduced in an evil day for a party purpose, and they have insensibly grown upon us; even perhaps to the loathing, and the cost, and the bitter mortification of their authors. Shall they be permitted to acquire strength and permanency? God forbid. Do you—not as a body, not ostentatiously, not as more pure or more perfect than your fellow-citizens of other religious denominations; but each individually, conscientiously, but firmly and decidedly, perform your duty, and though not one amongst you should prove recreant, I am convinced you will quickly find yourselves a palpable minority in the midst of your virtuous fellow-citizens. But let me, as the most rich and delicious favour you can confer upon me, feel the consoling assurance that, whichever side may receive his vote, at all events, no one of my flock will have acted corruptly, or will have encouraged corruption. If I have laboured assiduously amongst you, if I have devoted all my energies, such as they may be, to repel your enemies, to protect your fame, to promote your happiness, to extend your opportunities of information, to sustain your credit on earth, and to urge you to walk in the way to heaven; do not deny me one reward, which will enrich me, and fill me with consolation, and will clothe yourselves with honour and fill your consciences with peace. Exhibit yourselves worthy of the name of American Catholic republicans, pure, dignified, patriotic. If you differ, preserving charity in your differences; if you vote opposed tickets, yet showing courtesy to each other; leaving the record of your differences in the ballot-box, for the purpose of ascertaining the public will, but bringing away that harmony of affection, which, springing from the love of your common Father, will outlive the vanities of time in the beatitude of heaven! If I lay a few of the principles of our ecclesiastical law before you, for the model which I would entreat you to study, let not our fellow-citizens imagine that I

do not believe them capable of attaining that station to which I would impel you. No: I desire to urge your obligations, not only by the general topics which apply equally to them and to you, but also by those which are special to ourselves.

Our church has uniformly held the right of election, where it existed, as imposing the most serious obligations upon the voter: she considered every elector who preferred his private emolument or affection to the public good, to be a criminal. Such was the doctrine that she uniformly inculcated upon the citizens of those republics which existed in her bosom, before the unfortunate religious differences which separate our brethren from us, had their origin. She considered the proper use of the right of suffrage, a religious duty, and therefore, frequently, she procured that it should take place upon the Lord's Day, after the electors had attended at a Mass of the Holy Ghost, and gone to the holy communion: then, on their leaving the church, frequently in its very sanctuary, they deposited their suffrages, not under the suggestions, and the influences of unprincipled corruptionists, and where some had to force their way through the compact throng of factious opponents; but in a box placed at a distance from a crowd, at the foot of the altar, where the electors felt their responsibility to God, and their freedom from human interference. He who would directly or indirectly impede an elector or use any undue influence over him, was excommunicated by the church, and punished by the state. Gradually these formalities were neglected or abolished; they were only outworks, it is true, but when they were given up, the citadel was more easily invested, and has long since been destroyed. And little St. Marengo, under the papal protection, continued yet a sacred relic of the ancient Catholic secular democracies. The rest have been buried under the ruins which resulted from party strife, overwhelmed by the force and ambition of despots; or been dissolved in the rottenness of their corruption. My page is blotted by the tears which their fate produces—O! pray with me—that our beloved state may profit by the lesson!

In our ecclesiastical institutions this spirit was more diffusely spread and better guarded! Our fellow-citizens may, perhaps, regard this assertion with an air of incredulity! This is not the place to disabuse them of their mistake. Written constitutions, closely construed laws restrained within the exact boundaries of those constitutions, responsibility of officers, checks upon their power, rotations in office, and the absence of any privileged order, form the grand characteristics of all our monastic and religious communities; and in all these, the votes of the community formed the bulwark of their free-

dom, and insured the permanence and the vigour of the institute. Our canon-law guarded this freedom with the most jealous care and by the wisest provisions. Besides the regulations which I enumerated before, generally, in these latter cases, the following were common-law maxims. Any elector who was convicted of having voted for one whom he did not consider the best qualified, was disfranchised for the next election, and incurred three years suspension from his ecclesiastical offices, and was mulcted of their entire income. Any candidate who, by himself or by another, directly or indirectly influenced a voter, was disqualified for the office. All promises of support given by electors, even if with the sanction of an oath, were declared null and void, and the promises and oaths were considered highly sinful, because there existed a prior and a higher pledge which no promise, no oath could interfere with; the obligation to the community, that the vote should be given for the public good, and not for private advantage; it was then a sacred trust in respect of which no bargain or promise could be honestly or validly made. The trustee should retain his freedom, and be able to exercise his judgment, without pledge or bias even to the last moment. No voter could then bind himself, for such a bond might destroy the very object for which the trust was created. Any superior who directly or indirectly influenced the vote of his subject; any person who, having discovered how another voted, and did him an injury because of his vote; any person using threats or violence to procure or to prevent, or to influence a vote, and any person who, by fraud or force kept a voter from the exercise of his or her right of suffrage, were all excommunicated, and subject to other severe punishments. The managers or scrutineers, who examined the tickets, were bound to solemn and perpetual secrecy respecting the special votes of individuals, should they recognise the writing; the tickets were all burned, as soon as the result was ascertained and published; and the individual who voted, went alone to the ballot-box, from which all others but the scrutineers were kept at a considerable distance. It is by such provisions and regulations as these that the purity and permanence of these institutions have been secured. I do not urge the adoption of these nor of any such provisions by our state authorities. But I exhort you to enter fully into their spirit, from the conviction that it is that best calculated to support and to preserve our republics.

Surely, the persons who countenance such a system as that which has been gradually fastening itself upon us, cannot have reflected, that even though its encouragement were not criminal, it must be de-

structive to liberty; for its necessary consequence is to give a preponderating influence in every election, to wealth and corruption, by placing under their joint control a numerous band of unprincipled, organized, and mercenary voters. This evil becomes more formidable as we proceed. The sustenance of to-day, but excites the cravings of to-morrow; the infection of one spreads the contagion to another, until our whole atmosphere becomes tainted, and we shall be abhorred as a plague spot in our country. When a community becomes thus vile and venal, it is a ready instrument in the hands of either a domestic or a foreign foe. To adopt as facts the assertions of our parties, what is to prevent the northern manufacturer, whose mighty resources are so fearfully magnified, from outbidding our impoverished planters? How are our taxed and ruined agriculturists to compete with the Colonization Society, aided by the profuse bounties of Congress? What security shall we have that if our freemen's voices be this year purchased for British manufacturers, in opposition to the tariff, that they will not be next year purchased by the British government, in opposition to independent domestic legislation? Shall we even be able to raise the means of outbidding an organized, dependent, domestic faction, who would unite their power, and lavish their fortunes, in a desperate effort to place over us one of their body as a monarch, who would repay, with enormous profit, out of the public spoil, the contributions and the services of his adherents? Thus, were there neither crime nor disgrace in this system, it involves the ruin of the republic. And is it possible that the abettors of the system are blind to this? No! The misfortune in such cases is, that men, proud, ardent, and ambitious, committed publicly, upon a great political question, if they do not become reckless of all consequences, provided they can defeat their opponents, flatter themselves that, after their success, they can heal the evils, which they would not, for any consideration, perpetuate. But the history of the world, and our own experience, exhibit their delusion. The wounds inflicted upon the virtue of the state, if not mortal, are deep and dangerous; and certainly not to be healed by men of this description. Will our fellow-citizens, then, permit our liberties to be thus endangered, by allowing the public virtue to be debauched by men who either are honestly deluded or regardless of the consequences? No state in the Union—no country in the universe contains, in its ratio of its white population, a greater aggregate of men who condemn, despise, and spurn at such profligacy, than does South Carolina; but they should not dally with the mischief. Proverbially sensitive to everything which affects their honour, they

will not permit this degradation. Catholics! if you act on the present occasion, you will, I repeat it, be but speck in the multitude of your virtuous fellow-citizens. Yet, though your place be not conspicuous, let your station be on the side of virtue, of patriotism, of religion, or morality, of republican integrity, and the honour of Carolina. Let shame and disgrace, and contempt amongst his fellow-men, be added to the displeasure with which heaven frowns on the unhappy being, who would give or take a bribe, or betray his conscience, or block the passages to the ballot-boxes, or create disturbances, or in any way impede the freedom of his fellow-citizen, in the exercise of his most sacred right—that of voting according to the dictates of his conscience, for what he conceives the good of his country.

I have been exceedingly prolix, but you must excuse me; for my mind is absorbed in the subject, and I have left far more topics untouched, than those which I have dwelt upon. Yet, allow me to glance at one other, and I shall have done.—A large portion of you are adopted citizens, and of these, the majority have been born in the land that gave me birth. Not one amongst you, has loved that island with a more ardent affection; not one of you more dearly cherishes its remembrance; not one of you has been more deeply engaged in the contest for its rights, nor more richly earned the execration of his enemies. I am no renegade to Ireland; but I am now an American. Are Americans permitted to vote at Irish elections? You are qualified to deposit your ticket in the ballot-box, upon this distinct unequivocal condition, implied in your solemn oath; that you do renounce and disregard all other considerations in the discharge of your civic and political duties, save that tie which binds you to America. You vote then solely as a Carolinian: as an American. When, upon your approach to the polls, any person addresses you as an Irishman, or a Frenchman, or an Italian, or by any other appellation but Carolinian or American, his language is dishonest and offensive. He is either ignorant, or supposes you to be so, or he has some sinister view. There is a bribery of the affections. There is a bribery in adulation. There is a bribery in taking you by the arm on the day of election, and forgetting who you are, in a few days after. There is a bribery in reminding you of the bravery, and the patriotism, and the generosity of the Irish. And all this is the more insulting as the object of the adulation, or of the familiarity, is too plain to be mistaken. Of all things, I would caution you against pride or rudeness. But there is a degree of respect which every freeman should have for himself, which should lead him to refuse his arm to a man who only offers it to him for the purpose of

leading him like a prisoner to the ballot-box, and thus showing the public, and especially to his own party, how extensive is his influence; what votes he can command. You want no guide to lead you; you want no person to select your ticket. I hope you will not consider that I go too far, when I advise you to reject politely, the officiousness of those persons who thus obtrude upon men equally intelligent as themselves. I am anxious for your proper independence, I am studious of your respectability. But I warn you of your solemn, sworn obligation, that in giving your vote you recollect, that *you are an American! a Carolinian!* Would it not be well that after you had done your duty by depositing your ticket, you quietly withdrew? I am aware of the natural anxiety which every one feels to observe the progress, and to calculate and witness the result.—The only suggestions I would make, are, that its indulgence interferes with your industry, and exposes you to be drawn into any brawls or quarrels that might arise. At all events, if any such should occur, I would beseech you to retire.

I have done.—But I would beg of you to remark. 1. That I have neither expressed nor insinuated an opinion calculated to induce you to vote for one party, rather than for another. 2. That I neither directly, nor indirectly, impute to one party rather than the other, the evils which I lament. 3. That I do not directly, nor indirectly, allege any charge against any individual. 4. That although I have a distinct opinion as to what I conceive to be the correct doctrine in the present crisis, I have not expressed what that opinion is. 5. That whatever that opinion might be, it should have no influence upon your freedom, even were I to express it. 6. That although I have written freely and openly of the corruption which exists amongst us, yet I firmly believe, that notwithstanding the contamination of several, and the efforts of others, there does not exist anywhere a population that loves political purity more, or that will more nobly vindicate it, than the citizens of Charleston. 7. That whether judiciously or otherwise, I have come forward to address my flock from a deep sense of duty, and by no means to lecture my fellow-citizens of other denominations. And 8. That I have not been influenced by any one, nor have I received a suggestion, nor have I consulted with any person upon the present occasion.

And now, beloved friends, let me in conclusion, entreat of you not only to ponder seriously, upon what my sense of duty and my affection have urged me to write; but that you would also unite your prayers with mine, to the God of purity, and peace, and order, to preserve in those who are free from contagion, the virtue which he

loves; to open the eyes of the guilty to the contemplation of their misdeeds, to fill them with a salutary horror of the abominations of which we complain, and to bestow upon them the blessings of remorse and repentance. May he convert them to the ways of justice and patriotism! And in the difficulties by which we are surrounded, may he open to us a path of salvation and of peace; that guided by his Spirit, we may be led through our pilgrimage, bearing in safety the ark of our liberties! May the voice of his own wisdom proceed from that cloud which now rests upon it, so that the splendour of knowledge may issue from between the guardian cherubim, and an enlightened people released from all their perplexities, may in the well-ordered harmony of their states, go forth in a holy and indissoluble union, to triumph over every obstacle, and to subdue every enemy, till each individual shall under his own vine, and his own fig tree, enjoy his abundance in the security of peace, and rejoicing in prosperity.

Such is the prayer of, beloved friends,

Your affectionate father in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, August 24, 1831.

LETTER FOR THE CATHEDRAL CHURCH OF BALTIMORE

Addressed to the Clergy and Faithful of the Roman Catholic Church of the Diocess of Charleston

John England, by the Grace of God and of the Holy Apostolic See, Bishop of Charleston, and so forth.

To our beloved brethren, the Clergy and Laity of our said Diocess, health and blessing:

Beloved Brethren: Having learned that our venerable arch-bishop has formed an association for the purpose of making exertions to liquidate the debt of forty thousand dollars now due, for the erection of the Metropolitan Church of the see of Baltimore, and also for preventing the decay of what has been erected, and endeavouring to complete the edifice; and that the Catholics of the province of Baltimore, as well as of the exempt diocesses of the United States, have been invited to become members of this association, by paying yearly, for the accomplishment of these desirable objects, the moderate sum of one dollar each,—

We feel it to be our duty, whatever our own necessities may be, to exhort you strenuously, to enroll yourselves as members of the said association, and to aid otherwise, as far as your means and your particular obligations will permit, in speedily extinguishing the debt, and perfecting the buildings and decorations of the said Metropolitan Church. Nor is this to be considered a mere work of free charity, for it is in some measure a duty, and has always been considered from the earliest period of the church, in the light of an incidental obligation.

The Metropolitan Church holds nearly the same relation to the other cathedrals of the province, as each of these cathedrals does to the other churches of their respective diocesses: and in this point of view, it may be regarded as belonging to the whole province, at the head of which it stands.

The unity of our church is exhibited in the relation and dependence of its several portions. Its visible head is the successor of St. Peter, the chief of the Apostolic College, who fixed in the city of Rome the primatial see of the Catholic world; previously to which he and his associates had, from Antioch and Jerusalem, spread abroad the glad tid-

ings of redemption, and distributed the episcopal authority, by the creation of other sees. Alexandria was subsequently made the centre of a new field of missions; and each new see that arose within the patriarchate, regarded with peculiar veneration and deep interest that see from which it originally derived its existence, in like manner as these patriarchal churches acknowledged the primacy of honour and of jurisdiction in the See of Peter. In each patriarchate, when sees were multiplied, provinces were formed: and that church which, by reason of its antiquity, its importance, or its convenient location was found best suited for the purpose, was made the metropolis, and had precedence and a certain superintendence over the other sees of the province. Thus several archbishops were found in each patriarchate, and several suffragan-bishops in each province: and all formed but the one body of the church of the living God, in perfect organization of its visible head over its visible members.

In the year 1790, Baltimore was created an episcopal see, for the then territory of the United States. It was subsequently raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see; and as new diocesses were formed by parcelling out its ancient territory, they were made suffragan to their mother church, and bound to regard it with due veneration. This diocess was a portion of its ancient territory, and twenty years have not elapsed since our See was erected, and our territory separated from the ordinary jurisdiction of the archbishop; still he has in our regard a superintending concern, and we look to his cathedral as our metropolis. From that see the good, the venerable Carroll, sent forth his voice to many of you, and to our predecessors in the faith. It is dear to us also on this account.

This church also belongs to the province, upon another account. Three of our provincial councils have already been celebrated therein, and others will necessarily follow. It is the prerogative of the archbishop to select the church for the celebration of this assembly; and although this right is left unrestrained by the letter of the law, yet a variety of decisions have manifested, that when not greatly inconvenient, the Metropolitan Church should by all means be preferred, though it should not be selected to the great inconvenience of the suffragans. It is therefore probable that it will continue henceforth, as it has been heretofore, the place for deliberation on the important concerns of our province. Our venerable archbishop has exercised with moderation the right which the discipline of ages, and the sanction of a variety of canonical enactments have thus given to him, of sending by his own authority, and in virtue of his office, through the entire province, col-

lectors of your alms and bounty, to aid in the erection and preservation of this edifice. He has appealed to you for a moderate contribution, and thrown himself rather upon your charity, than upon his claims as of justice. It behooves, us, therefore, to meet his appeal in the spirit of affection, of liberality, and of religion.

We therefore again earnestly beseech and exhort you to answer in a becoming manner to this appeal: remembering that, on our day of distress, we have been generously aided by our brethren of Baltimore, and that God will bestow his blessings upon those who are zealous for the glory of his house.

We therefore request each priest of this diocess: 1st. To procure that in his district associates be enrolled for this good work; 2dly. To appoint some one or more collectors, who shall receive the names and the money, and, 3dly. To have the same transmitted to us at the earliest opportunity, so that we may forward them to the proper officer in Baltimore.

Given under our hand, in Charleston, this 15th day of August, (festival of the Assumption,) in the year of our Lord 1839.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

By the Bishop.

R. S. BAKER, *Secretary.*

Letter Addressed to the Roman Catholic Inhabitants of the Canadas, and Nova Scotia, and to the other Roman Catholic Subjects in America, of the King of Great Britain and Ireland

CHARLESTON, S. C., Oct. 8, 1825.

Brethren:—You and I profess the same religion, we are members of the same church; that church which has had its origin in Jerusalem, now eighteen centuries since—and has made progress, from the river Jordan to the ends of the earth. Our fellow-Catholics are found in every nation in which the name of Jesus is known, and our clean and holy oblation is offered up from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof; whether we use the Latin rite, the Greek, the Sclavonic, the Syriac, the Coptic, whatever rites have been lawfully retained by those who believe in the same doctrines, who use the same sacraments, who are united under the same visible head, the successor of Peter, His Holiness, the Pope, Leo XII. We have followed in the footsteps of our fathers, as they have followed theirs, and long since the mighty leaders of our numerous host have passed the boundaries of earth, and we now know that the Apostles who have conducted our predecessors, have, together with many of their followers, been crowned with the glory of conquest, through the merits of our Saviour. No matter what is our language, or our country—we are brethren in faith, we march together under the standard of the cross.

We should have a sympathy for each other. To exclude others from our charity or our affliction would be irreligious, but to have sympathy for our brethren under affliction, is humane, generous, charitable. He who commanded us to love all men, inspired also his Apostle to write a preference in affection for the household of faith: and this glorious Apostle did himself manifest his zealous love for his brethren.

This principle is not confined to religion, though it is connected therewith; it extends to every bond of brotherhood in which men can be united, whether it be the link of fellowship voluntarily created or accidentally produced, the bond of marriage, the close union of the common land of nativity, or the strong and necessary social tie of com-

mon country and common government. Acording as those ties are multiplied, the claims for affection and sympathy become more strong.

A large portion of your fellow-Catholics and fellow-subjects, seven millions of the inhabitants of Ireland, lamentably persecuted for professing your religion, claim your sympathy. Many of you are led to believe that they are rather a discontented than an injured people, and you have been perhaps led by their enemies, to believe that if their conduct was as good as that of the Canadian Catholics, they would be as you perhaps are, without any ground of complaint. I believe they have been exhibited to you as not worthy of your sympathy, because of their turbulence and discontent; and you have been asked, "does the British Government persecute you because of your religion?" When you answer "no," you were told, "That it was plain proof that there must be some cause different from that of religion, to call for the severity of your government against the turbulent Irish."

Inhabitants of Canada, many of you are Irish. Thousands of you are Irish Roman Catholics; you have in Canada the same dispositions that you had in Ireland. Why are you now free from persecution, at this side of the Atlantic? I will tell you it is because you are neighbours of our glorious republics.

Canadians, why were you not persecuted before the Revolution which separated these states from you? Because, between the time of the surrender of your fathers to Great Britain, and the period of the Revolution, you were people just taken from a powerful enemy, and it would be gross impolicy to outrage your feelings upon a sudden. But I am in possession of documents from the archives of the British government, to show that it was intended to subvert your religion as soon as it would be convenient to do so. But before that convenient time arrived, the American Revolution occurred, and the folly of some of the first revolutionists led them to place in the enumeration of the misdeeds of Great Britain, her toleration to your religion, for they had still much of English Protestant prejudice; you also recollected the petty religious warfare of the New England colonists, the shooting of Father Raffles, and other deeds of some of your southern neighbours—you adhered to Great Britain. When the United States were free and independent, it became necessary for Great Britain to treat you with lenity and kindness in order to conciliate your affection. Thus you have escaped the lash of the persecutor, and the fang of the tyrant, your situation has been that of the most favoured portion of the British empire, whilst the situation of the Irish Catholics has been the very reverse.

Were the navy of England powerless, or were Ireland as contiguous to France as you are to our union, Ireland would not have been scourged: a generous master protects his dependants, and exerts his strength in defence of those who are placed under him; a man of a different character is noted for oppressing the helpless, and for caressing those who have powerful friends, or are able to release themselves when they will from his bondage. Ireland is weak; you could easily join our union.

You are placed in that happy state, that if Great Britain should violate her contract with you, she cannot prevent your obtaining instant redress. But I need not inform you that the Atlantic Ocean is wider than the river St. Lawrence. Believe me, though you should not advert to it, you feel the difference of position. May God preserve your happiness, and increase your comfort and prosperity.

You have been told that much was done for the Irish Catholics, and yet they were never satisfied. It is true they are not now ground down as severely as they were when you first became a British people. Bishops ar not now liable to be hanged. Priests are not hunted, and on their way to a prision, made a mockery of by the rabble. A Catholic might now even have a horse worth £100 without being obliged to give him to the first Protestant who paid him £5, that is one-twentieth of his value, as happened to the Bishop of Cork, since you joined England. A boy of twelve years of age, the youngest of his family, will not now be able to plunder his aged father and mother, and his brother and sister of the paternal estate, because they are Catholics, and he has gone to a Protestant Church, and signed his name to thirty-nine articles, not one of which he understood, but to all of which he assented, for the purpose of legalizing his robbery and his disobedience. One cousin cannot now, as I have known to be done, and I am not as yet forty years old; after spending his share of the patrimony go and swear in court that, up to that period, he was an idolater, in order by his perjury to rob his industrious and conscientious cousin of the other moiety, which came to him by descent from their common ancestor; and were my father still living, he would not be under the necessity to which he was once driven in his youth, after seeing the last shred of the remnant of what his ancestors possessed taken away from his father, to fly from his native county lest he should be sent by a Protestant bishop for trial before a judge at the assizes, who must necessarily transport him as a felon, because he could not escape conviction upon a charge of having taught a whole book of Euclid's elements, without having forsworn the religion of all his ancestors, and

of the great bulk of the Christian world. I acknowledge to you that now the Catholic is not persecuted, as he was then. Were Canadian Catholics ever persecuted in this manner by Great Britain? You will tell me "No." I tell you that since you were British subjects, those things, and worse than those have occurred in Ireland. You are not then at liberty to charge the Irish with discontent at being in a good situation, under a good government, for that government which was obliged to treat you well, was at liberty to oppress them, and has most wantonly abused that liberty. I write what I know, I testify what I have seen. You are not then to argue from your comfort to that of your Catholic brother in Ireland.

The relaxations which Britain made in her worse than heathen code of persecution, were made through fear, without merit, with a bad grace, when she could not avoid making them. She acted without generosity, from mere self-interest, and she always endeavoured rather to change the mode of annoyance, than to desist from worrying her victim. I shall give you the testimony of Mr. Sheridan, the friend of your present king, upon the subject:

"The fact is, that the tyranny practised upon the Irish has been throughout unremitting. There has been no change but in the manner of inflicting it. They have had nothing but a variety in oppression, extending to all ranks and degrees of a certain description of the people. If you would know what this varied oppression consisted in, I refer you to the penal statutes, you have repealed, and to some of those which still exist. There you will see the high and the low equally subjected to the lash of persecution, and still some persons affect to be astonished at the discontents of the Irish. But with all my reluctance to introduce anything ludicrous upon so serious an occasion, I cannot help referring to a little story which those very astonished persons call to my mind. It was with respect to an Irish drummer who was employed to inflict punishment upon a soldier. When the boy struck high, the poor soldier exclaimed, "Lower, bless you," with which the boy complied. But soon after, the soldier exclaimed: "Higher, if you please." But again he called out, "A little lower." Upon which the accommodating boy addressed him, "Now, upon my conscience, I see you are a discontented man; for strike where I may, there's no pleasing you." Now your complaint of the discontents of the Irish appear to me quite as rational, while you continue to strike, only altering the place of attack.

Colonial Catholics, the British government having failed in its efforts to extirpate the Catholic religion by persecution, now seeing

that they must ultimately yield to necessity, are occupied in endeavouring to subject that religion to their control, and to affix to emancipation, conditions which, viewed in the abstract, might appear speculatively harmless, but viewed in connexion with the circumstances of Ireland, would be practically destructive to our religious principle. So the Irish bishops, priests, and people have repeatedly declared.

Another effort is about to be made by your Irish brethren to obtain redress of the manifold evils with which they are oppressed; and those evils are manifold indeed. They cannot be privy councillors, masters of the rolls, judges in the King's Bench, judges in the Common Pleas, barons of the Exchequer, secretary at war, lords of the Admiralty, lords in Parliament, secretary of state, chancellor of the exchequer, president or fellow of any college in any university, secretary for the colonies, governor of a colony, lord lieutenant of Ireland, attorney-general of England, or attorney-general of Ireland, solicitor general, king's counsel, member of any college of physicians in England, mayor of any city, chief magistrate of any town corporate, member of the House of Commons, sheriff of any county or city, director of the Bank of England, director of the Bank of Ireland, president of the Board of Trade—nor in either of an hundred other offices, which it would tire one to enumerate and you to read. They cannot endow any church, bequeath any property for any benefit to their religion, nor for any charity connected therewith. They cannot establish any glebe for the maintenance of their clergy, they cannot confer any literary degrees upon their children in their schools or colleges, they have no share in the management of the funds granted for the education of the poor, but those funds are uniformly placed in the hands and under the control of those hostile to the Catholic tenets, and who meanly use a variety of indirect and perplexing modes for drawing the poor Catholics, by their wants, to sell the religion of their children. The Catholic clergy are insulted and vilified on a thousand occasions, and in all party trials the Protestant sheriffs, who return juries not by ballot, but by selections, are generally charged with being partial.

I will mention to you an instance which came under my own observation.

The present master of the rolls in Ireland, is now a Protestant and a baronet. He was formerly a serjeant-at-law, which place he could not hold without being a Protestant. He frequently served Mass, and was examined in his catechism in the same parish church that I served Mass and was examined in. He was then a Roman Catholic.

His younger brother, who is now a general, was a Catholic schoolfellow of mine—he is now a Protestant. I know the other members of the family to be Catholics.

When this gentleman was a serjeant-at-law, he led a prosecution in the city of Cork. Two persons were to be tried for the same offence, under separate indictments. One was a Catholic the other a Protestant. They were separately arrainged, and both ready for trial. One of them, the Protestant, was indicted in a number previous to the Catholic—say Number 59—the Catholic, 60. In course No. 59 was placed at the bar—and the clerk of the Crown asked the sheriff for the list of jurors. The sheriff handed him what was called the long panel, which contained about one hundred names. The list had not been called, when the judge, by the request of the lawyers, put Number 60 forward for trial in place of Number 59. Immediately, the sheriff called for the list, observing that he had made a mistake and given a wrong paper. He was sitting at a desk, where I was perhaps the only person in court who could observe what he did. I saw it—he gave back the same identical list. I could not yet observe what the mistake could be. But the mystery was solved as soon as I heard the list read over. I do not know whether the master of the rolls in his varied avocations can have any, even the most trivial recollection of me, nor do I know if he even then knew my name; I stood behind him, and in a low voice said, "Serjeant McMahon, one would imagine . . . was to be tried for Popery." He turned to me and said the observation was incorrect and unfounded. I only remarked, "perhaps I have better reason to know what I say, than you suspect or are aware of." I am convinced that he knew nothing of what I saw, and probably does not to this day. I added, "I will warrant you the challenges and the settings aside and will leave you a good jury for the purpose." Nothing more passed between us. The jury was formed after the prisoner had made his twenty peremptory challenges. Men against whom it would not be easy to show cause, came thick and threefold to pass upon him, but they were men who of all others he would not have chosen. He was however acquitted, for want of evidence.

The whole management was this: the list consisted of names written upon two separate sheets of paper pinned together. When the sheriff got it back he merely changed the order of the two papers. But by this simple contrivance after the list was called, I saw that the names were so arranged that it made a most serious difference as to the character of the jury—which paper should be first read.

What could be done? I saw the trick, but it would be useless

to testify it. Any one who knows Ireland, would laugh at my folly in exposing myself to ruinous persecution by a protected party, and no good could result.

Catholic Colonists, your state is not so wretched as this. You have no notion of the persecution which your Irish Catholic fellow-subjects endure.

You have, where you dwell, perfect religious freedom. The Protestant dissenters in Great Britain and Ireland are also seriously oppressed, though compared with the Catholics their sufferings are trifling and light; yet they ought not to be subjected to any penalty or inconvenience for professing the religion of their choice. But to shut our eyes to the gross and ridiculous and monstrous tyranny of a Protestant government saying, that every man has a right to be led by his own conscience only, in matters of religion, and yet cruelly punishing men for the exercise of this conceded right. You will agree with me in the principle, that God gave to no government, spiritual or temporal, commission to inflict bodily or civil or political punishment upon man for mere religious error. He reserves the infliction of such punishment as the obstinate heretic or the criminal infidel may deserve, to his own tribunal. He gives to the church authority to teach his doctrine, to administer his sacraments, to regulate her discipline—and by spiritual censure to punish her refractory members. To people he leaves the right to constitute their government, upon the government he imposes the obligation of preserving peace and securing property. But to neither has he committed the decision of man's eternal destiny; this he reserves for himself; to neither has he given a commission to propagate his doctrine by cruelty, but to all he has given a command to love one another.

The Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland are anxious, not merely for emancipation for themselves; they desire religious liberty for their dissenting brethren, they desire to have their state in the mother country assimilated to yours. Surely you cannot but feel that humanity, charity, and justice require you to aid them. You can materially do them a service which is not in our power to perform: you need only to be told how you can aid them, and I feel confident you will eagerly avail yourselves of the opportunity to do so.

You have strong claims to the gratitude of Britain, nor is she very willing to displease you: when she was opposed to our states, you stood by her with singular fidelity, many of you made your bodies ramparts upon our frontiers for the protection of her possessions. Call upon your government to emancipate your brethren, call upon her for the

sake of justice, of humanity, of religion, of policy, call upon her by the gratitude which she owes you, by her regard for her own character. She now, a cruel, shameless, persecuting nation! No! The nation is not. The people of Great Britain have led the way. The British Protestants have given to you a noble example—Colonial Catholics. Do British Protestants love Irish Catholics better than you do? Do the Protestants of this Union love Irish Catholics better than you do? The first have petitioned—the second cannot. We cannot approach a legislature upon which we have no claim, with which we have no connexion. Call upon your Protestant neighbours. It will be better if they join you—if they do not, the honour will be yours, the reproach will be theirs. Unite your voices—entrust your petition to the patriotic Brougham, and in the lords you will have perhaps a difficulty of choice between the truly noble Duke of Sussex, the brother of your king, the truly venerable Doctor Bathurst, the benevolent Protestant Bishops of Norwich, and the steady friend of the Irish Catholics, the Earl of Donoghmore, or his gallant brother Lord Hutchinson, the personal friend of George IV.

My brethren, I have taken the liberty of thus addressing you, because I know the cause to which I invite your aid deserves your support, and I know your application will have great and deserved weight. Whether your good, pious, learned and venerable hierarchy will feel that this is a claim in which they are concerned, I cannot surmise; but this I know, that if they should vouchsafe to join in your application it would not detract from the esteem in which they are so deservedly held; it would draw closer the bands of brotherhood, between the prelates of the same empire at both sides of the Atlantic—it would diffuse heartfelt joy through many a bosom of the Irish under their charge, and tend to make the Canadian native, and the Irish emigrant one loving people, more than would any other measure that could be devised, and many of the people of these states would send up their prayers on their and your behalf, and none more fervently, brethren, than your sincere friend and respectful admirer.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IN BEHALF OF THE CATHOLIC CONGREGATIONS WHICH SUFFERED BY THE GREAT FIRE AT CHARLESTON

Addressed to the Charitable Citizens of the United States

Beloved Brethren:—You are already aware of the awful dispensation of Divine Providence, by which nearly one-third of the city of Charleston has within a few years been reduced to ashes; the principal destruction having taken place towards the termination of the last month, leaving a melancholy token of ruin and of desolation to point out the former abode of industry, of wealth, of decoration and of happiness. You know that in the great conflagration, about one thousand of our stores and dwellings have been consumed within a few hours; and extensive sufferings and despondency have come upon families whose prospects were, on the very day previous, as cheering and as flattering as their enjoyment appeared to be secure.

You have not only learned that we have thus heavily suffered, but with generous ardour and with creditable emulation, you have pressed forward to cast your offerings of benevolence and of affection into the fund whence relief has already been dispensed to numbers who have had no other resource, and will yet be given to alleviate the distress of many, who, without this aid, would sink under the weight of their calamity. In union with thousands, I earnestly beseech the Father of mercies and the bestower of every good gift, that he would give to you light and knowledge and docility and zeal for his service and for the salvation of your own souls, together with the blessings of abundance and of content upon this earth; and a recompense for the charity which you have manifested.

Beloved brethren, it would be on my part unpardonable obtrusion, were I in the first moments of the common grief and common suffering of the whole body of our citizens, to press upon you the consideration of a particular class, as entitled to your sympathy and your aid for a special purpose, however high and however holy may be the object to which I would draw your attention: but as you have nobly provided for the general want and the more pressing necessities, permit

me to solicit your notice of a case, which, I trust, will also engage your good feeling.

The Roman Catholics of this city are, as a body, the least wealthy of its religious denominations. In the other parts of the state they are exceedingly few and by no means rich. The Catholic diocess, of which this state is a portion, is, I believe, without question, that which of all others in the United States, has the least wordly means as compared with its spiritual wants,—and thus its members in this city may be considered as the least provided for. I shall lay their situation before you.

From the number of Catholics in this city, and the manner in which they are separated, as well as from their situation in life, the larger portion of them having little power to dispose of their own time, even on the Sundays, it is absolutely necessary to have three churches; two in the city and one in the outlets. About thirty years since, a brick edifice of moderate dimensions had been erected and was used as the only place of our worship. It was surrounded by a cemetery, where the remains of those who originally worshipped in the church are deposited. The church, latterly known as St. Mary's, had lately undergone a thorough repair, and been fitted up in such a manner as gave the prospect of many years of service with very few demands for its preservation. A debt of upwards of $2,000 remained unliquidated, but which it was hoped the savings of a few years would extinguish, together with the interest to which it was subject. The congregation and their friends had subscribed to pay the amount of the expenses, and had defrayed all except the above sum. In one night, the church and its organ were destroyed, notwithstanding every exertion to save them. An insurance had been effected for a sum considerably under the value of the property destroyed, but of the money which will be obtained, when the sum of two thousand dollars, due as above stated, shall be deducted, the remainder will not be one-fourth of the sum necessary to place the congregation in the same state in which they were, for the convenience of the divine offices, previous to the conflagration; and its friends have suffered more or less by our general calamity. A subscription has been entered into for rebuilding the church, and though the sums promised are, under our state of loss and suffering, as large as can be expected, yet they fall greatly below what is absolutely necessary to build upon our ancient site, a church of such materials as our city council now wisely requires to be used in building within the incorporate limits.

About seventeen years since, it became necessary to provide a

location for a cathedral; and an excellent site was purchased, upon which the present temporary building of rough framework, used as a cathedral, (St. Finbar's), now stands. Years had passed away before, even by extraordinary exertions, this purchase-money and its accumulating interest could be paid up. Indeed I may say, that it has only just now been effected. The situation itself is most eligible and convenient; though by no means near the centre of the city, and very remote from the outlets. Our poverty is such that we have been obliged to consider as likely to be used for many years at least, as our cathedral, a rough, low frame building, originally thrown up merely as a temporary accommodation, upon the rear of the lot, and which was only intended to be used for two or three years, within which time it was hoped a substantial cathedral would be erected. This is now the only church we have in the city and its vicinity.

Previous to the fire, when it was used exclusively for the accommodation of its own congregation, it was filled to overflowing, and now the congregation of St. Mary's have been invited to use it with those who previously frequented it! I need not dwell further upon a description of what you must conceive!

During some years, the necessity of providing a place of worship for the Catholics on "Charleston Neck," or the outlets of the city was manifest, and ground was purchased which has been used as a cemetery, reserving a sufficient portion for the church. Several efforts have been made to raise the funds necessary for this purpose, but they have proved abortive. Mass has, however, been celebrated in a private house on the Neck during a considerable time past, for the accommodation of those who can be admitted within so limited a space:— the foundation of the church (St. Patrick's) has been laid; a contract was entered into with a very respectable mechanic, for the erection of the building, and it was hoped that by an effort, which promised well, the sum necessary for defraying the cost of a frame building would be procured. A small part only of the subscriptions had been collected, when the fire consumed the larger portion of the frame and other materials which were in the shop of the architect, who is himself one of the heaviest sufferers by the conflagration! But our chief loss was, the total ruin of many of our subscribers, and the almost insuperable obstacles to our obtaining a sufficient collection to meet the payments which we have undertaken.

Behold then our situation! Deprived, we may say, of two churches; having left to us only one, exceedingly mean and insufficient; in the diocess which of all others in the United States has the least re-

sources among the members of our communion; with our fellow-citizens in our community, who would be disposed to our aid, severly smitten, and our own means exhausted, we appeal to you, to extend to us your benevolence! You have given food to the hungry amongst us,—you have given drink to the thirsty, you have clothed the naked, you have sheltered the houseless and consoled the afflicted. We now intreat you, to afford us an opportunity of worshipping according to the dictates of our consciences, at those altars before which our fathers and their progenitors bowed in adoration of the heavenly Father, of his beloved son Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. So shall our suffrages be there offered on your behalf, that you may be protected from the consuming fire, from the blast of pestilence, from the scourge of famine, from the noon-day evil, from the shafts of malice, from the snares of darkness, from disquiet at home and from disaster abroad!

Some of our brethren of other religious denominations have also been deprived of their places of worship, but their friends and their associates have with a creditable liberality come to their aid. Their edifices will rise from the ashes, more durable in their structure, more commodious in their arrangement, more decorated in beauty. Our expectations are more limited; we must be content with less. But even for procuring what is merely necessary, we must be dependent upon the generosity of our friends, of the charitable, of the benevolent, of the liberal.

We address ourselves confidently to all, but I think that we may, without any unkindness in the discrimination, feel, that we have stronger claims upon those who profess that same creed to which we adhere, and we rely upon them greatly, though not exclusively, to befriend us in the day of trial.

I am aware, that were I to send priests to solicit the benefactions of the well-disposed, it would be probably attended with more success than any appeal of this description is likely to be. It is not, however, in my power to do so, without going through a process, which I do not feel to be convenient to me at present, or subjecting the priest so sent to liabilities to which I would not expose him. Again:—the number of priests in this diocess is exceedingly small, and I could not spare them from the duties of their mission for even so important an object as this. There are many other objections which it would be useless to enumerate. I am, therefore, placed under the necessity of making this public appeal, requesting the aid of the clergy and laity, of the benevolent, of the charitable, of the friends of religion, and of

the afflicted, to enable us to build up in this city, and on the Neck, the churches of St. Mary and of St. Patrick.

Any sum transmitted to me for that purpose, shall be duly acknowledged, and applied according to the directions of the benefactor. Should no specification be made, I shall divide equally between both churches the sums that I receive. Should any specification be made, I shall have the sums applied to one or the other, as I shall be directed

I shall finally take the liberty of requesting the venerable prelates and their reverend priests, through the United States, to have the charity to receive and to transmit to me such sums as may be given to them for this purpose. And should any of my lay-friends be kind enough to act for me upon this occasion, I shall have their names published, so that they may the more easily receive and transmit to me the sums contributed in their vicinity.

I entreat you, beloved brethren, to remember us also in your prayers, that God may sustain us; and we shall also be mindful of you, and if our humble supplications shall find acceptance before the throne of Grace, we trust that our benefactors will receive from us that return which alone it is in our power to make.

May the peace of God be with you, brethren, is the prayer of

Yours,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

CHARLESTON, S. C., May 28, 1838.

LETTERS IN THE HOGAN CASE

Introductory Note: The history of notorious Hogan case is fully given in the thirteen lengthy and exhaustive letters written by Bishop England. Led by a spirit of charity and by what he deemed, at the time, a spirit of justice, Bishop England undertook to investigate the case of Reverend Mr. Hogan with a view of peacefully settling the affair. His attitude deeply hurt Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia. The desire of removing this misunderstanding was the immediate motive prompting Bishop England to write the letters in question. These letters eminently show forth Dr. England's humility and his love of truth and justice.

Rev. William Hogan came, a young priest, from Ireland and after a short stay at Albany, N. Y., came to Philadelphia, where the administrator of the diocese gave him a temporary appointment to St. Mary's parish in that city. Shortly after the arrival of the new bishop, Doctor Conwell, the ecclesiastical faculties were with drawn from Mr. Hogan, who appealed to the Archbishop of Baltimore, but lost his case. Instead of submitting to higher authority, he continued to officiate at St. Mary's, supported by the lay trustees of the parish. He was excommunicated by the bishop, but still remained and now tried to defend himself before the American public by publishing a pamphlet filled with an entirely false presentation of his case. The matter was also dragged into the Civil Courts. More infamous pamphlets were published by his friends and supporters. For two years the schism continued at St. Mary's, when Mr. Hogan finally left both, the place and the priesthood, to practice law. He died at Lowell, Mass.—ED.

LETTER I

CHARLESTON, Sept. 6, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—After the publication of a late pamphlet, by the Reverend William Hogan, entitled *An answer to a paragraph contained in the United States Catholic Miscellany, edited by the Bishop of Charleston, under the head "Philadelphia,"* I feel myself called upon to give you an explanation of some of its statements.

The writer commences by asserting that I am the editor of the Miscellany and the compiler of the article, by pretending to answer which, he takes occasion to assail me. The fact of my being, or not being the editor of that paper, or of my having or not having written the paragraph, makes nothing for or against the statement I wish to explain.

In the pamphlet, page 9, is the following statement: "That at dinner, at Reverend Mr. Power's, at New York, I stated that I left

Charleston much prejudiced against Mr. Hogan; but becoming acquainted with the causes which led to the differences between Doctor Conwell and him, and with the characters of the priests of Philadelphia, my opinion was entirely altered, and I rejoiced to have it in my power to remove him from their society." The fact is, after Mr. Hannan and Mr. Power had informed me that Mr. Hogan had come from Philadelphia to obtain and to follow my advice, Mr. Hogan was introduced to me for the first time. We had a very long conference, in which he gave me his account of the causes, and his account of the priests; and I acknowledge I was greatly inclined to think that he gave me a pretty correct view of the entire, and the professions he had made were so perfectly in unison with those which would express the feelings that would become him, I did think I had been before in error, and that he was unjustly, or at least thoughtlessly punished; and did hope that upon my having an interview with you, or your authority to make arrangements, peace would be restored to Philadelphia; and upon this ground I asked Mr. Power's permission to invite Mr. Hogan to dine, and at dinner I did state, that if his account was correct, as I hoped it was, I had been in error, and so forth. To state, therefore, absolutely what I asserted conditionally, is not correct. I must add, my impressions now are, and have been for a considerable time, that when I used those expressions even conditionally, I was wrong in my estimate of the parties, and what has not often happened me, culpable for having formed too hasty a judgment, and expressed it prematurely.

You will recollect, Right Reverend Sir, that between the first interview in New York, which was sought by Mr. Hogan as I before stated, and my arrival in Philadelphia, I had two interviews with you, one when I called upon you at the house of our friend, Right Reverend Doctor Connolly, who was then so engaged in ministerial duties as not to be able to join us; the other when I met you at the house of the Reverend Mr. Power. We had never before met, at least, in America. Subsequently to my promising Mr. Hogan that I would endeavour to obtain your authority to investigate his case, as I have since discovered, several persons took great pains to misrepresent us to each other. I know you were exhibited to me in a false light, and I know that you spoke of me in a manner that you would not have done, had you not been deceived. The consequence was, we met each other with mutual distrust. You thought I wished to dictate to you how you should govern your diocess, and looked upon my interference with more than jealousy. I know you were led to imagine that I wished to raise Mr. Hogan and to depress you if I could. I confess that my notions of

your conduct towards Mr. Hogan were very different then to what they now are, and I was led even to doubt whether your acts were altogether canonical. I then believed as fact what I now know to be fiction. I have since learned facts, of the existence of which I then was not aware; of course, I have changed my opinion. I have now no doubt upon my mind that your acts were not only valid, but perfectly regular.

With these impressions upon our minds, we met for the first time strangers to each other, to converse upon a subject which each of us was led to view in a different light.

I was under the impression that you had suspended Mr. Hogan for crimes, the existence of which he denied, and you had not sufficiently proved. You thought I wished to bring you to account to me for your conduct, when I asked you whether you had any objection to allow me to investigate the truth of the allegations upon which he was punished. You stated that, whatever your own belief might be, you did not act upon those allegations; and you stated that probably in my diocess he might do some good; that in yours, you did not think him useful, and that if he came to mine, and that I received him, you authorized me to remove his censures. I asked whether you would testify to his moral character, or suffer me to examine evidence as to it in your diocess. You stated that you made no charge against his morality, but that you would give no farther power to any other bishop, than that of absolving him from censures upon his leaving your diocess. I then stated that I would consider him innocent of the crimes reported, unless you would either state to me that he was guilty, or allow me to investigate their nature and the evidence upon which they rested. You would not extend the power, and we parted, probably without any accession to our mutual confidence from the interview.

I shall now, Right Reverend Sir, select the passages of which I conceive you ought to obtain explanations from me. And I feel happy at Mr. Hogan's having put it in my power to remove from your mind the impressions regarding me, which must have been gaining strength by the increase of time and the want of explanation. They are the following:

Page 10. "On his arrival in Philadelphia in October, I waited upon him; he then stated that he was empowered to arrange all differences between the bishop, the people, and myself.

Page 11. "In which case he could prosecute his claim against the Bishop of Philadelphia at Rome, or by the Bishop of Charleston, as his agent.

"The necessary redresses, of the success of which Bishop England expressed his fullest conviction not a doubt need be entertained.

Page 12. "They could not, however, avoid remarking the strong and energetic mode in which Doctor England expressed his reprobation of the line of conduct observed by Doctor Conwell; the perfect conviction he entertained that a correct representation of the affairs of his diocess at Rome, would eventuate in his removal and the appointment of a more worthy and enlightened successor, and his own entire devotedness to promote so desirable, and so indispensable a result, for the attainment of which he did not hesitate to declare, 'I will spend the last thread of my existence.'

Page 14. That the more culpable Doctor Conwell and those about him acted, the more certainly could the Reverend Mr. Hogan calculate upon their removal and redress; and that the Reverend Mr. Hogan would have much greater advantages by appearing as plaintiff against Doctor Conwell, than by acting as defendant.

Page 15. "To which Doctor England observed, that the conduct of Doctor Conwell, in this respect, was abominable.

"That he conceived it highly necessary to preserve the Reverend Mr. Hogan's case and that of the people entirely distinct, as there would be then two chances against Dr. Conwell, and if the Reverend Mr. Hogan's failed, the people might still succeed and procure his removal.

Page 16. "Bishop E. replied, that he gave his opinion and advice upon the subject without knowing what course the trustees would pursue; that he thought it would be prudent to bear a temporary inconvenience for the purpose of obtaining an important benefit, and that by adopting the plan he recommended, the people would be certain of having their grievances redressed, to promote which he pledged himself to use every means in his power.

Page 17. "They had the honour and veracity of a bishop's pledge that Doctor Conwell should be deposed and removed out of the city, an object desired by every sincere Christian and peaceable citizen.

Page 24. "He arrives in this city empowered by Doctor Conwell to adjust all differences, and to see justice done; but no sooner does he receive the commission, no sooner is he invested with temporary jurisdiction by the unhappy bishop of this diocess, than he endeavours to undermine, to degrade, to depose, and expose him to further contempt, 'to accomplish which, he would spend to the last thread of his existence.' "

They are reducible to the following charges:

1. One of the Reverend Mr. Hogan's, "That I stated upon my arrival in Philadelphia, in October, that I was empowered by you to arrange all differences between you, the people, and him; to see justice done, and that for this purpose I was invested by you with temporary jurisdiction."

2. A charge by the same person, "That I had pledged to the trustees the honour and veracity of a bishop, that you should be deposed and removed out of the city, an object desired by every sincere and peaceable citizen."

3. A charge by the same person, "That I endeavoured to undermine, to degrade, to depose, and to expose you to further contempt, to accomplish which I would spend to the last thread of my existence."

4. A charge by Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan, "That I stated to them, as part of the substance of my answer to Mr. Hogan's letter to me, that he could prosecute his claims against you at Rome, or by me as his agent."

5. By the same, "That I stated in my answer, that the necessary steps should be taken immediately for obtaining the desired redress, of the success of which I expressed my fullest conviction, that a doubt need not be entertained;" and farther, "That I entertained a perfect conviction, that a correct representation of the affairs of your diocess at Rome, would eventuate in your removal, and the appointment of a more worthy and enlightened successor, and my having expressed my entire devotedness to promote so desirable and so indispensable a result, for the attainment of which I did not hesitate to declare, 'I will spend the last thread of my existence;'" and farther, "That I did take those necessary steps for your removal, by advising them how it may be compassed, one of the modes to facilitate which, I conceived to be the keeping of Mr. Hogan's case, and that of the people, entirely distinct, as thus there would be two chances against you, and if the Reverend Mr. Hogan failed, the people might still succeed, and procure your removal;" and farther, that I stated, that "By adopting the plan I recommended, the people would be certain of having their grievances redressed—to promote which, I pledged myself to use every means in my power."

6. By Messrs. Ashley and Fagan, "That I observed, that your conduct, in resorting to the infamous means you used to destroy Mr. Hogan's character, and to induce the congregation to acquiese in your treatment of him, was abominable."

If I made the assertion contained in the first charge, I stated a distinct falsehood, for the only power which you did, or would give me, was authority to receive the Reverend William Hogan into my diocess,

if he would come thither; and next, power to absolve him from your censures upon his coming under my jurisdiction. I distinctly state, that the assertion of Mr. Hogan is totally devoid of truth, as I never stated that you empowered me to arrange the differences, and to see justice done, and that you gave me temporary jurisdiction for this purpose; but, on the contrary, I complained to Mr. Hogan, to your own clergy, and to Mr. Hogan's friends, that you refused those powers to me.

The three gentlemen, Messrs. Ashley, Leamy and Fagan, swore, pamphlet, page 13, that "After a pause, Doctor England replied, that he should endeavour to remedy this inconvenience, by requesting Doctor Conwell, as a particular favour, to permit him as his deputy to nominate," and so forth. And again, Doctor England stated, "That from his knowledge of Bishop Conwell, he was not sanguine in his hopes that his request would be granted." It must be then plain, that if those gentlemen swore truly, Mr. Hogan must have stated untruly, or that I told Mr. Hogan one story, and told those gentlemen a different one. The fact is, I told them both the same, which was, that you refused to allow me any authority to interfere farther than I have before stated; and the fact is also, that I did use those expressions to the three gentlemen in the drawing-room, which I had the use of at the Mansion House, on Thursday, October 18th, and that, at that time, Mr. Hogan belonged to the diocess of Charleston, for I had received his request to receive him, and by your authority did accept of him by the letter, which I was concluding when those gentlemen were introduced.

The second charge carries its own refutation on its face. The trustees knew that I could not depose you nor remove you from Philadelphia; therefore, they must have looked upon me to be a madman, had I pledged the honour and veracity of a bishop, that what I could not effect should be done. You will perceive, that the words, "an object desired by every sincere Christian and peaceable citizen," are not attributed to me by the charger, but are the expression of his own opinion, for which I am not accountable.

The third charge will stand or fall by the fate of the fifth.

The fourth charge is made by the three gentlemen, and here I stand upon new ground. With Mr. Hogan my interviews had an official character, not as having any jurisdiction in your diocess, but having your authority to receive him into mine, and to absolve him from your censures, should he consent to come. Those new witnesses and I met merely as private individuals, whom I was anxious to advise to pursue a line of conduct, which, I hoped, would put an end to a very unhappy schism in a very respectable congregation.

They testify, that in those conversations I was guilty upon the fourth, fifth, and sixth charges. The first is, that I stated to them as part of the substance of my answer to Mr. Hogan, that he could prosecute the claims against you at Rome by me as his agent. Indeed, sir, I do not know how I can meet this charge, otherwise than by saying, they must have greatly mistaken what I said, or meant to say. I prefer quoting from the allegations of the accusers, to loading the case with new documents, except it be unavoidable. Look to page 18 of the pamphlet:—"You shall have my permission to go to Rome, to institute any suit or suits, which you, or the Catholics of Philadelphia, think proper for the recovery of your rights." I rather think, Right Reverend Sir, that you will not construe this to mean, that I offered to become his agent. The gentlemen, then, misunderstood me, or I misrepresented to them what I wrote.

My opinion of "his rights" was distinctly given to him and to them, for I told both that his case was wholly untenable before any ecclesiastical tribunal, and that to have a decision against him, would not occupy any canonical court five minutes: but, that if he was of a different opinion, I had no objection to his trying it, though I had no doubt of his defeat; and that, if he chose to go to Rome, I would not prevent him. Indeed, the gentlemen testify my opinion, and my expression thereof in their and Mr. Hogan's presence, for they say, in page 14, Messrs. Ashley and Fagan's swearing, "Doctor England stated that the vicar, in vacant sees, could only make temporary arrangements; upon which point a different opinion was maintained by the Reverend Mr. Hogan, then present. Mr. Fagan remarked, that this was a point of canon law, upon which, as laymen, they were incompetent to decide; but, taking it for granted, he being the elder gentleman, was correct, and that in consequence, Mr. Hogan was incorrect in officiating against the bishop's will in St. Mary's Church. The bishop should have rested upon ground of canonical right, to drive Mr. Hogan out of his diocess," and so forth.

You must perceive, Right Reverend Sir, by this, that I distinctly told him and them, that he was incorrect in officiating against your will in St. Mary's, and that I did not offer to be his agent in prosecuting a suit for rights which I told him he had not, and that repeatedly, though I offered to permit him to prosecute it, if he and the people of Philadelphia thought proper. Mr. Ashley, whose acute penetration is of no inferior cast, saw the full force of my observations in so strong a light, that he instinctively turned to the part of the room where Mr. Hogan sat, and very emphatically addressed him in words which I shall not easily forget:—"Then, Mr. Hogan, it is now plain that you have

been leading us into error all through." I could add much more on this topic, but my object is to be as brief as possible. I shall, however, make one remark, that in comparing the conversations as taken down by the witnesses adduced against me, with my own notes taken at the time in Philadelphia, I find a very serious difference, particularly in omitting much of what I said, the insertion of which is absolutely necessary, to give the remainder its proper meaning, and the omission of which, altogether distorts and destroys the sense.

To enable me to answer the fifth charge, it is necessary that I should exhibit the view which I took of the Philadelphia case. From you, Right Reverend Sir, I had no explanation. Mr. Hogan and his friends assured me, that in the administration of the diocess all things were mismanaged; they stated that you and your clergymen had entered into conspiracies to destroy the character of Mr. Hogan; that the reason of his persecution was the superiority of his talents, the extent of his zeal, and his devotion to the discharge of his duties; that upon this ground, they upheld him and opposed you, for their object was the maintenance of religion, which would perish in Philadelphia if he were removed.—Though I could not believe that you or your clergy did or would enter into such conspiracies, yet I did believe that the charges then exhibited against Mr. Hogan in the Mayor's Court, by a woman for profligate conduct, were unfounded. Mr. Hogan offered me, repeatedly, to prove his innocence to my satisfaction. I told him it was unnecessary, for I did believe him innocent. But, I also told him, that he had no jurisdiction in Philadelphia—that he was acting uncanonically, irregularly, and criminally in continuing to officiate in St. Mary's—that I knew from my conversations with you, that it was beyond hope that you would restore him—that the only rational mode of extricating all parties from their difficulties, was, as I had power to receive him into my diocess, and to absolve him from censures if he came, to come—and that I would absolve him, and not only give him a mission, but, if he thought that those charges against you and your clergy were true, the truth or falsehood of which I could not pronounce upon, he should have leave to prosecute you and them in Rome, and if the charges were proved, I had no doubt of your and their removal.

I told the lay gentlemen the same, and gave them as my opinion, that Mr. Hogan's own case was indefensible; but said, if their charges against you were proved, I had no doubt you would be removed. And when they stated their ignorance of the mode of proceeding, I told them upon that ground there should be no difficulty; for, if they gave me sufficient proof of the truth of their assertions, I would feel it to be my

duty to embody them into the shape of charges, and, if necessary, forward them to my own agent in Rome, to be exhibited against you and proved by them; and if they could succeed in the proof, I did not entertain a doubt of your removal; and farther, that if I did believe you to be guilty of the crimes, I would spend the last shred (not thread) of my existence for your removal. And, Right Reverend Sir, I now repeat, if I did believe the truth of those charges, I would do now what I then said; and if you thought me equally guilty, you would, I am convinced, feel yourself bound to act so towards me.

This view of the case, Right Reverend Sir, was what I wished them to take, and laboured to prove to them the advantages which would result from acting upon it. I stated to them, that, in place of having recourse to the regular tribunals for the redress of their grievances, they had usurped a power which was not theirs, and defied the authorities to which they were subject; that if those authorities abused their power, or were unfit for their places, there was a regular tribunal, which, upon proper application and sufficient proof, would remove the criminal or the incapable, and thus they would obtain regular redress: but that, so long as they united Mr. Hogan's case, which was evidently bad, with their own, which might possibly be good, and which, if the allegations could be proved, was certainly good, they destroyed that good case by its incorporation with a bad one.

The fact of their having made those charges they admit, page 14. "Mr. Fagan" remarked, that "the bishop should have rested upon the ground of canonical right to drive Mr. Hogan out of his diocess, and deprive the people of his services, and not resort to the infamous means he afterwards used to destroy the Reverend Mr. Hogan's character, in order to induce the congregation to acquiesce in the bishop's treatment of him, which, in whatever light it was viewed, appeared to be as unjust and tyrannical, as it was unmerited." "To which Doctor England replied, that the conduct of Doctor Conwell, in this respect, was abominable." I was at the moment seated in a room with a gentleman, for whose intellect I had and have high respect, (Mr. Ashley,) upon whom I was anxious to make an impression by reasoning, for I knew of no way of leading him, but by the conviction of his understanding. Suppose I had no regard to truth, I must at least be allowed so much common sense, as to know that my pronouncing a positive condemnation of you in such terms, without having been able to examine the evidence, would at once baffle my hopes of gaining upon him. I am not in the frequent habit of too hastily pronouncing a condemnation of any man without evidence; and though I had abundant evidence of your having

been charged with injustice and tryanny, and a variety of other crimes, I had no evidence of their truth. The fact is, I did say, from the mutual criminations, and especially the production of the charges then before the Mayor's Court, "that there must be abominable conduct somewhere;" but I acquitted the gentlemen then present, of any participation therein; as I did, without expressing it, acquit you then and now—for if I believed you to be guilty, I would, long since, have endeavoured to find the proof, and to send the charges to Rome against you, even if the schismatics were to join the Catholics in opposing me.

I did not, then, Right Reverend Sir, observe, "that the conduct of Doctor Conwell was, in that respect, abominable," though it would have been true to state, that I remarked, "the conduct imputed to Doctor Conwell was abominable."

The statement, "That the more culpable you and those about you were, the more certainly could the Reverend Mr. Hogan calculate upon their removal and redress, and that it was better for him to appear against you as plaintiff than as defendant," having been expressed as my opinion, is, in itself, a truth: but it is stripped of its circumstances, with which I will beg leave to clothe it.

It was stated by the gentleman who called upon me, that if they made certain concessions which I recommended, you, and those about you, would treat them worse than ever; upon which I remarked, if your case be good, so much the better—for the more culpable, and so forth.

It was asked, could not Mr. Hogan remain in St. Mary's, and the suit be undertaken? I answered, it could not, for two reasons: first, his case being bad, he was by the canon law looked upon as an intruder, and should appear as defendant against the bishop, who would then be plaintiff; and it would be more advantageous to him to be plaintiff than defendant. The second reason is here unnecessary.

I beg to add to this, one other paragraph respecting your clergy, page 29. Mr. Hogan asks me, "Was not my language moderate, when contrasted with your own observations on those gentlemen, in public and in private, while in New York and in this city?" I beg to assure those reverend gentlemen, that neither in New York nor in Philadelphia, in public or private, have I made any farther observations upon them or their conduct, except to complain of the manner in which one of them had acted several times respecting myself, and to state that, if they were the criminals which Mr. Hogan has painted them, they deserved to be ranked in the lowest scale of society. He has calumniated them to the world, and he now treats me in the same way, and adds to this the attempt to make each of us believe that it was the other who assailed him. It would,

indeed, be no small gratification to our common assailants to bespatter us both, and then excite us to quarrel for having soiled each other.

You and I, Right Reverend Sir, have had this trick played off upon us before; it has had partial success, but I trust it will not be a second time successful.

I shall take the liberty of explaining some other passages of the pamphlet in a future letter, because I owe it to my station to show, that, although I might have been injudicious, I was not criminal.

I had forgotten, in its proper place, to notice the following assertion of Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan: "They could not, however, avoid remarking the strong and energetic mode in which Doctor England expressed his reprobation of the line of conduct pursued by Doctor Conwell." Page 12.

This refers to my first interview with those gentlemen. I shall beg leave to state one fact which took place, and which I am convinced those gentlemen will not deny. In that interview Mr. Fagan expressed himself in very strong terms of crimination of you, and was continuing in a most unmeasured manner, when I stated my wish that he should avoid the topic altogether; for, though I regretted as deeply as he did such occurrences as he described, which I supposed he must know to be true, and which I would not therefore question, still their mention was unnecessary, and the subject was to me most unpleasant. Mr. Leamy used some expression of coincidence with my wish, which I have not entered and have forgotten; but Mr. Ashley, in a smart manner, which appeared to me natural to him, struck lightly several times with his fingers the under part of the table where we sat, and repeated, "Right, right, right: better say no more." The only way in which I can account for their statement, then, is by supposing they mistook Mr. Fagan's expressions for mine.

Another very natural explanation would present itself: because it is a fact that I did, in strong and energetic terms, reprobate the line of conduct imputed by them to you; and as they stated that you pursued that line of conduct which they imputed to you, they probably wrote as they felt, and transferred to me a conviction which I did not feel, viz.: that you pursued that line of conduct which I reprobated. I certainly would prefer this to charging them with having sworn what was contrary to the fact, and which I do not believe they would do; but I cannot destroy my own recollections, nor disbelieve my own notes, taken upon the spot.

Allow me, now, Right Reverend Sir, to give you a view of what, I believe, will be admitted a fair representation of the case: 1st. I

could not have known the nature of the transactions in Philadelphia, except from the testimony of those who witnessed them, for I had not been present. 2d. Whatever impressions were upon my mind, must have been created by the testimony which I received. 3d. If the impressions were wrong, the fault was in the witnesses. 4th. The accounts I had received were from the Reverend Mr. Hogan and his adherents. 5th. You did not think proper to give me any explanations. 6th. All my subsequent declarations must, of course, be founded upon the supposed truth of the accounts which I had received from the witnesses: for they were not, and could not be founded upon my own observation. 7th. I did wish to examine testimony on both sides, but you did not think proper to authorize me to do so. I was, therefore, constrained either to abandon altogether the attempt of restoring peace, or act upon what testimony I had. 8th. Reverend Mr. Hogan made several statements to me, which he said he could or would prove. 9th. Messrs. Ashley, Leamy, and Fagan, supported those statements. 10th. I could not, either in common politeness or in common justice, tell those gentlemen that their statements were untrue, because they gave them as facts, with which they were acquainted, and of which I could have known nothing of my own knowledge. 11th. I, therefore, conceived myself warranted to assume the truth of their statements, without having my mind finally made up as to their absolute truth or falsehood. 12th. Upon their assumed truth, I gave my advice. 13th. I distinctly saw Mr. Hogan's case untenable, and I as distinctly told him and them so. 14th. I distinctly saw, that if their allegations were true, and that they proceeded canonically to their proof, they might be certain of redress, and I as distinctly told them so. 15th. They expressed their difficulties, from want of knowing how to proceed. I told them that, if they gave me the proofs of the allegations, I would obviate that difficulty, and manage the whole for them, provided they conducted themselves as became Roman Catholics; and in place of continuing an unjustifiable and irregular opposition to you, they would prosecute you in the proper court. 16th. They stated, that by following my advice, you would, in the meantime, have the church, they be thus triumphed over, by your obtaining all that you desired, and that you would treat them worse than before. 17th. I answered, that it was often necessary to suffer temporary inconvenience to obtain a permanent good; and that, the worse your conduct would be, the more certain would they be of your removal. 18th. They asked, whether no mode could be devised to remedy even this temporary inconvenience, by appointing clergymen whom you could not remove, and in whom they would have confidence

during the suit? 19th. I answered, that this could only be done with your consent, which I feared you would not give, but which I would endeavour to obtain. 20th. I did write to you, as I promised that I would. 21st. But, they preferred continuing their former line of conduct, to adopting my advice. 22d. And now they charge me, not they indeed, but Mr. Hogan, with having accused you of those crimes which they imputed to you, and of having endeavoured to expose and to degrade, and to remove you.

Now, Right Reverend Sir, for the support of every one of those propositions, I refer to their own published documents, and to the common sense of any individual.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir,

Your obedient, humble servant and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

We this day lay before our readers, two other letters from the bishop of this diocess, in explanation of the pamphlet published in the name of the young man employed in St. Mary's Church. One object of the phamphleteer evidently was, to set the clergy quarreling with each other—in this, we have no doubt he will be disappointed. We shall reserve our own remarks for the present.

CHARLESTON, Sept. 11, 1822.

To the Reverend B. J. Fenwick.

My dear Sir:—You, perhaps, have seen a pamphlet just published by the Reverend Mr. Hogan against me, in which, page 16, is the following passage, extracted from a conversation, stated by Messrs. Ashley and Fagan to have been held between them and me in Philadelphia, on Friday, the 19th of last October:

"A desire was expressed, to know whom it was intended should be substituted for the Reverend Mr. Hogan, in St. Mary's Church, while proceedings were carrying on at Rome; as the name of the Rev. Mr. Fenwick had been mentioned for the purpose, who, it was observed, from his intimate connexion with the interests that predominated at Baltimore, would be highly obnoxious to a people that had suffered so much from the unprincipled intrigues originating in that quarter. Doctor England acquiesced in the correctness of the observation, and said he should not be the person; he also stated an instance of improper conduct on the part of that gentleman and the Archbishop of Baltimore, in the diocess of Charleston, since his own appointment thereto."

I feel, my dear sir, that my leaving this passage unexplained, would be ill-treating you. The conversation was held upon an assumption,

which I considered and stated to be an improbability, viz., that Doctor Conwell would give me power to appoint for St. Mary's. On that account, I took no note of this particular part of our intercourse, as I looked upon it to be altogether immaterial to the subject under arrangement; and even if Dr. Conwell had granted my request, I thought it would be sufficiently early for me to enter upon an inquiry, when I should have received power. But, if I recollect rightly, Mr. Fagan was the gentleman who expressed the desire; to which I answered, that I had not thought upon the subject as yet, and feared I should not need to think upon it, as I was still of the opinion which I expressed on the previous day to himself and the other gentlemen, that Doctor Conwell would not accede to my request. He then mentioned your name, as a person whom I might in such a case possibly appoint, and inveighed pretty loudly, and by no means sparingly, not against you personally, but against Jesuits and Sulpicians, and all the clergy of Baltimore, and stated that your appointment would be obnoxious. I said that he had need have no apprehension of your appointment, first, because much as I wished the restoration of peace and religion in Philadelphia, I preferred the interests of my own diocess to those of any other, and I would not easily part with you if I could detain you; and next, because I knew you would not come, for you had already, to my knowledge, refused Doctor Conwell's invitation, which was most pressing and flattering—and that you had declared to me that nothing could induce you to destroy your peace of mind, by entering upon the ministry in Philadelphia. I farther acquiesced in the correctness of the observation which had been made, but which the gentlemen have omitted to record, though I distinctly recollect it, that were your virtues ever so great, your appointment would not produce peace, if you were highly obnoxious to the people. But, I trust I need not assure you that I did not acquiesce in any observation which would imply your want of any qualification for any station of the ministry; and my acquiescence in such an observation, would have been my own condemnation, for, at the time I had left you as vicar-general in charge of my diocess, and had to express to you those feelings which I shall ever cherish, of gratitude for your virtuous discharge of that duty.

As to my stating an instance of improper conduct on your part, and so forth, though I have no distinct recollection upon the subject, which would enable me to speak positively as to the manner in which it was introduced, I do recollect, that in some way, I did mention as a fact, the archbishop having given to you a commission as vicar-general of the diocess of Charleston, in December, 1820, though he had received my

notice of appointment and consecration, and intention of coming to my diocess, and renewal of jurisdiction to the clergy therein, on the 21st of the preceding month. I do not know what caused it to be introduced, nor how it bore upon the subject. But, supposing this to be the fact, it was evidently no improper conduct on your part; and you have since, by the exhibition of the original document, convinced me that what I stated was not a fact, because the commission which I thought bore date in December, 1820, was given in December, 1817, and was for the Carolinas and Georgia, then part of Baltimore.

I trust, my dear sir, that this explanation will satisfy you and the respectable clergy of Baltimore, that I did not acquiesce in the truth of charges against them, to which I was under the necessity of listening; but as to the truth or falsehood of which I could give no opinion, as the alleged facts, if ever they took place, occurred, some of them, whilst I was in Ireland, and others before I was born. I trust, also, that the insertion of this clause, "if ever they occurred," will not be taken by Messrs. Ashley and Fagan, as questioning their veracity; it is but practising a degree of caution, which I have been taught by themselves, to prevent the observance of politeness being misconstrued into an acquiescence in the truth of what I have no opportunity of ascertaining.

I am also convinced that this explanation will frustrate what I conceive to be the object of the pamphleteer, viz.: to produce quarrels between us.

Believe me to remain, very reverend and dear sir, your much obliged,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER II

CHARLESTON, Sept. 12, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—In my former letter to you, I trust I have succeeded in satisfying you, "that I did not assert that you gave me powers which you had not given."—"That I did not pledge to the trustees of St. Mary's Church, the honour and veracity of a bishop, that you should be deposed and driven out of the city." "That I did not endeavour to undermine, to degrade, to depose, and to expose you to further contempt," and so forth. "That I did not state, that your conduct, with respect to Mr. Hogan, was abominable." "That I did not offer to be Mr. Hogan's agent to prosecute you for the violation of his rights." But, that I did inform him and his supporters repeatedly, "that Mr. Hogan was incorrect in officiating against your will in St.

Mary's Church;" and that, in all the advice which I gave, to have the charges against you sent to Rome for examination, and in my offers to send them, and to bring the case to a proper hearing and decision, I did so upon the assumption, that proper proofs of the charges should be first made out, and that I should be satisfied of their truth and their sufficiency; and that my object was to produce peace, by placing in a regular and orderly way, for proper decision, before competent tribunals, those complaints and recriminations, which had destroyed the peace of a large and respectable city, embittered the comforts and destroyed the harmony of private families, and covered with obloquy and disgrace a church of which, however unworthy I may be, I was one of the bishops.

It now remains for me to show to you, and to my flock, that I am not guilty upon other severe charges which Mr. Hogan has thought proper to make against me. So far as I am individually concerned, I should have been content to be silent, and leave to those who know me, to say whether they believe me capable of acting as I am charged to have done. If I know myself, John England would be quite satisfied to say nothing upon the present occasion; but, the character of the individual will sometimes give a tinge to the estimation in which his office will be held, especially in a country where the nature and the duties of the office, and the qualifications necessary for the discharge of these duties, are very imperfectly known. And upon this ground, I feel myself called upon to give some additional explanations.

I shall, in the present letter, examine the following passages of the pamphlet:

Page 6. "In the course of my remarks on the Right Reverend Editor, I shall confine myself, exclusively, to a recital of facts; and I am prepared to show, from under his own hand, and from his own lips, that in his public and private calumnies against me, he is guilty of the most irreconcilable inconsistencies, and the most shameful departure from truth!

Page 10. "I consented, provided he appointed a clergyman in my place exclusively for St. Mary's Church. He pledged himself, in presence of the Reverend Mr. Power and the Reverend Mr. O'Hannan, that he would, if possible, find a clergyman to officiate in my place. I replied, that unless he could provide a clergyman, or satisfy the people of the propriety of my going for a time, I could not think of going with him.—His answer was, as to satisfying the people, leave that to me; I will engage to do that. Upon these conditions, entered into in the presence of the Reverend Mr. Power,

and the Reverend Mr. O'Hannan, I expressed, in writing, my consent to become his subject.

Page 16. "The Reverend Mr. Hayden was then mentioned as one that would be acceptable, and Doctor England said, that should his application be successful, he and some other gentleman, agreeable to the congregation, should be appointed. To which Mr. Ashley replied, he had no doubt of his success, in that or any other request, that might procure the removal of the Reverend Mr. Hogan, as that seemed the only object Bishop Conwell had at heart; and again observed, that the trustees could not consent to be answerable for such a measure. To which Dr. England replied, 'Leave that matter to me; I will take all the responsibility from Mr. Hogan and the trustees.' He was then asked, whether he would address the people in the church? The answer to which was, 'Whenever it may be necessary.'

Page 18. "The day after being Saturday, I inquired of the right reverend editor, who was to officiate on the following Sabbath morning? His reply was, 'Shut up the church.' Of course, as he did not perform his promise, in procuring a clergyman to officiate in my place, nor come forward to satisfy the people, my contract was *ipso facto* annulled, and I continued the discharge of my functions in St. Mary's Church.

Page 19. "At the close of a few hours he believes every charge against me. I expected he might come forward in person, the following Sabbath morning, and reconcile the people, as he promised, with my absence.

Page 21. "I expected this letter would have allayed the rancour which, for some hours, seemed to have taken possession of the prelate's bosom. I hoped, that the recollection of his being the minister of the Most High, and having to approach his most holy altar on the following morning, would inspire him," and so forth.

The entire of this is reducible to a single charge, viz.: That I violated a contract which I made with him—which contract was, that if he came to Charleston, I would procure some clergyman to officiate in St. Mary's, or else satisfy the people of the propriety of his going from them for a time.

Now, if this was our contract it must be evident I did not violate it, for as he did not come to Charleston, I was not bound to perform my part of the engagement.

But, he states that I manifested a disinclination thereto, and gave proof of my want of intention to fulfill it, by telling him, "When he

inquired on Saturday, who was to officiate on the following Sabbath morning," to "shut the church," and thus that he was released.

Now, suppose I made no such contract with him, it will be plain, that my telling him on Saturday morning to shut the church, would not, on my part, be a violation thereof. What are his own words? "He pledged himself, in the presence of the Reverend Mr. Power and the Reverend Mr. O'Hannan, that he would, if possible, find a clergyman to officiate in my place." My answer is, then, very simple. It was not possible for me, because I had no right to give jurisdiction to any clergyman, when I had none myself—but, I did all that was possible for me to do. I consulted the clergymen of the city whether they thought the interdict under which the church lay, extended to prevent mine, or the Reverend Mr. Power's officiating in St. Mary's, and was told by them, that they were convinced I would do wrong, even if it did not extend so far, to officiate therein, as they had no doubt it would be against your wish. It was not possible, then, for me, nor for any other clergyman, to officiate there. But it was possible for me to apply to you, Right Reverend Sir, for power to appoint a pastor, and I did so, but I could not receive your answer in sufficient time for that Sunday. Why, then, did I not go to explain that to the people, as I contracted to do? The sequel will show.

But, suppose the procuring a clergyman, if possible, for St. Mary's, formed no part of my contract with Mr. Hogan, would I then have violated it, by not having a clergyman in the church? Now, the fact is, there was no such clause in our contract; and Mr. Hogan has not stated what was the fact, when he asserted that there was.

In my letter, page 17 of his pamphlet, are specified, all the conditions which I bound myself to fulfill, and the manner in which this letter was given by me, will show that it must contain all the conditions to be fulfilled by me.

I arrived from New York in Philadelphia on the 16th of October, which was Tuesday: at that time the Mayor's Court was occupied in the inquiry arising out of the complaint of Mary Connell. Mr. Hogan called upon me: I was then, as I still am, under an impression of his innocence of the charges made by that woman. I received him in the manner in which I ought, from the impressions on my mind. On that and the next day we had several interviews, and from a determination which I had come to—not to see the lay gentlemen of either side, unless after I had closed, if I could, the ecclesiastical question—I declined the visits of some of the most respectable gentlemen who did me the honour of waiting on me, sending as my apology the determination I had formed.

On Thursday morning, the 18th, Mr. Hogan and I had agreed upon the conditions of that letter, except the last two, the subjects of which did not then present themselves. Mr. Hogan was then asked by me to write a request to me to receive him into the diocess of Charleston, upon the conditions we had stipulated, and I showed him a form which I had drawn up, and which he was to copy. He then, for the first time asked me who was to officiate at St. Mary's, and seemed anxious to learn what should be done upon that head. I told him if he came to my diocess he would not be responsible for St. Mary's; and that, unless he chose to continue acting irregularly, he could not officiate there; and that, of course, it was the business of the Bishop of Philadelphia to appoint a pastor; that Mr. Hogan had no right to continue, and that he knew I had no right to appoint. Mr. Hogan said the people would be greatly displeased and disappointed. I stated that their displeasure or disappointment ought not to sway his determination, but he should weigh the propriety or impropriety of his own acts. He said he was disposed to follow my advice, but was at a loss to know how he should explain his conduct to the people. My answer to him was, that I would make his difficulties as few as possible—that he could very easily state that it was by my advice, as a friend whom he consulted, his acts were regulated, and throw the weight of explaining the grounds of that advice upon me. He then expressed a wish to see the trustees before he would write the letter. I distinctly told him that the impression upon my mind was that the trustees would not be pleased at his acting as I recommended; that now, I thought he had received sufficient reasons from me to convince him that he would do right in following my advice; but that his seeing them would only increase his difficulties, and entangle him in embarrassments arising from former pledges, from feelings, and perhaps reproaches, which I wished him to avoid. I concluded by saying that, as a priest, he ought to be led by maxims of duty, and not by the wishes of any party—that he could see them if he pleased—but, that as I foresaw it would only increase his difficulties, I advised him against it. We then had a long conversation as to the consequences likely to follow from leaving the church without a clergyman; and with this distinct knowledge of my views, and with a distinct knowledge that I had no power to appoint a clergyman for St. Mary's, he took home the form which I gave him to copy, and sent me his application copied from that, requesting me to receive him into the diocess of Charleston, upon the condition, on my part, "of his having leave to go to Rome, should he think proper, to prosecute on his own, or on the behalf of the Catholics of Philadelphia, any suit or suits he or they may think proper to

institute against you,'' and promising ''to obey me, and to be directed by me as his bishop.'' Thus, it must be plain that at that time I made no contract with him ''to provide a clergyman, or to satisfy the people of the propriety of his going for a time;'' and he not only ''thought of going'' without this contract being made, but actually agreed to go. I, indeed, promised him, that I would explain to his supporters the ground of my advice; and I fulfilled that promise, and told him that as the ecclesiastical part of the question was now closed, I would gladly see the lay gentlemen; and as I had before declined his invitation to dine, I now, in a message through Mr. Power, informed him that I would dine with him on that day, Thursday. Shortly afterwards I received his application, and whilst the Reverend Mr. O'Hannan was yet waiting for the answer, which I instantly wrote, at about 11 o'clock, Messrs. Ashley, Leamy, and Fagan did me the honour of calling. I, of course, could not then have forgotten the contract which I had just made, nor could I expect to keep from their knowledge so important a part of that contract, as that which was all they cared for, and what Mr. Hogan stated he insisted upon, and which, if I agreed to, he would have instantly told them.

What do they state? That I mentioned to them the substance of Mr. Hogan's communication, and of my answer, which contained all the conditions. When I mentioned the whole of my agreement and advice to them, they naturally saw that there was no provision for placing a clergyman in the church, and as naturally, page 12, Bishop England was asked what would become of the congregation in the absence of the Reverend Mr. Hogan, as it was observed that ''while the grass was growing, the steed might starve.'' To which he replied, ''the trustees might shut up the church,'' and so forth. Now, Right Reverend Sir, I will ask three questions: 1. If I had stipulated with Mr. Hogan, not an hour before, that I would find a clergyman to officiate in the church, would I have then told the trustees that the church was to be shut up? 2. If I told the trustees on Thursday that the church was to be shut up, was it necessary for Mr. Hogan to inquire of the Right Reverend Editor on Saturday, who was to officiate on the following Sabbath morning? And 3. If I contracted with Mr. Hogan to provide a clergyman for the church, must I not know he would give the trustees information of that contract?

I promised Mr. Hogan, that I would satisfy his supporters that he acted by my advice, and that I would endeavour to convince them, as I thought I had convinced him, that they and he would do well to follow that advice, and I redeemed this pledge, for those gentlemen

swear, (p. 11,) that after explaining what that course was, "Dr. England went into a diffuse train of reasoning, to prove the necessity and propriety of the course he recommended."

I did not even lead them to hope, that I could remedy this want of a clergyman in the way they desired, for I told them, that it could only be remedied by your giving me, as a particular favour, permission to nominate a pastor, but which permission I did not expect. Thus, it is plain, I did not lead those gentlemen to think I would officiate, or procure a clergyman to officiate.

On that day before dinner, in the presence of Messrs. Power and O'Hannan, I told Mr. Hogan, that now he having left the diocess of Philadelphia, and being under my jurisdiction, might if he chose be absolved from his censures, as I had in that case your power to remove them. I then, upon the expression of his wish to have them removed, required him upon his knees to profess his full belief of all the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, to express his regret for his publications, to promise to obey the decisions of the See of Rome upon all the parts of his case, and until such decision could be had, to obey me and to follow my directions upon each and every part thereof. He made those declarations and promises, and I then absolved him upon those conditions; after which we went to dinner.

He after dinner said, that having now done everything which I required, he thought it was not incorrect to ask what he was to do in Philadelphia, and what I meant to do regarding him in Charleston. I told him, that of course he knew that if ever he had jurisdiction in Philadelphia, he had now resigned it; that I could not give him power where I had none myself, and that he must of course altogether cease from doing any ministerial acts, and prepare as soon as possible to go to Charleston. He made several observations upon the trouble which he said would probably follow the closing of St. Mary's, and said he should not like to witness it, and for many other reasons he was anxious to go as soon as possible, and in the course of the conversation he expressed his wishes for Mr. O'Hannan being placed near him, and so forth.

Next morning, which was Friday, Mr. Power informed me at an early hour, that Mr. Hogan wished to see me, and at the same time showed me a paper which Mr. Hogan gave him, for my signature, stating all the conditions which I had agreed to as favourable to Mr. Hogan, and as conceived by him. Mr. Power expressed a strong suspicion of Mr. Hogan's dispositions, from some conversation which he had with him. I stated that I could have no objection to give in writ-

ing what I had agreed to, as I considered by word equally binding upon me as any other pledge I could give, and that I would ascertain Mr. Hogan's disposition by putting a test before long. Accordingly, after some conversation with Mr. Hogan, I accompanied him to his boarding-house, and whilst breakfast was getting, I made some verbal changes in the form presented by Mr. Power, stating my reasons to Mr. Hogan, which seemed to have their due weight with him. Mr. Power copied it during the time I was at breakfast. I then gave it to Mr. Hogan to reperuse, which he did. I then asked him if it contained all the conditions which he had made; to which he answered, that it contained more than he had hoped for, and expressed his gratitude. I then signed it, and presented it to him, on the morning of Friday, the 19th of October, and not on the 20th, as it is dated in the pamphlet, at about nine o'clock, at the house where he boarded, not far from St. Mary's Church. This is the document which is found in the 17th and 18th pages of his pamphlet. The copy differs from the original in two words towards the close of the second paragraph. The original has, "which I could not give you, did I believe you guilty of the charges advanced against you." Mr. Hogan has printed it, "did I believe you guilty of any of the charges advanced against you." This addition is immaterial, for the charges were those of immoral conduct, which I did not believe to be well-grounded.

Thus, I think it must be clear, that this document recites all that I had engaged to perform up to that period; and in this there is no mention of my having engaged to provide a priest to officiate at St. Mary's but there is positive evidence by Messrs. Ashley, Leamy, and Fagan, that I distinctly told them, on the preceding day, that unless Dr. Conwell granted permission to me, and which permission I did not expect, to appoint a clergyman, the church should be shut, or only open to Dr. Conwell or his delegates.

My proof, Right Reverend Sir, does not end here. After I gave Mr. Hogan this letter, I then told him, "Now, sir, you are done with St. Mary's Church, will you give me the sacrament it if be in the tabernacle; and if you have got any particles in your pixis, that I may give it to the Reverend Mr. Cooper?" He assented, and we went together to St. Mary's Church, where, on his knees, he gave me the key of the tabernacle, from which I took the vessels containing the sacrament, which I removed thence to St. Joseph's, where I gave them up to the Rev. Mr. Cooper, to place the sacrament in the tabernacle there; and, as Mr. Hogan stated the vessels to be his private property, I brought them back to him. At leaving the church, I remarked, that

God alone knew when mass would be celebrated there again; and I stated to him, that as he may feel a delicacy in attending at mass, on Sunday, in one of the churches, and as he could not say mass himself, and as he was free from censures, I would say mass, if he chose, at his house, to give him an opportunity of assisting at it.

Upon my return to Mr. Hogan's, I met Messrs. Ashley and Fagan, whom I informed of what had been done, and went into my reasons again at length. In their history of this interview they preserve much of the substance, but by no means the order of the conversation.

After I had given my reasons, Mr. Ashley remarked, that Mr. Hogan had acted from himself, and not by the advice of the trustees, and that before the congregation they stood blameless; and asked Mr. Hogan how he could reconcile his present acts with his former declarations, especially his late pledge to the people from the pulpit, to continue in the church? I interposed, and told Mr. Ashley, that perhaps at that time Mr. Hogan viewed the subject in a different light from what he now did; and that if any person was responsible, it was I who gave the advice. Mr. Ashley then said, that either Mr. Hogan or I should, from the spot in which the pledge was given, give an explanation to satisfy the people, that it was not the act of the trustees. I stated, that when I gave the advice, I did not know how the trustees were disposed, nor was I acquainted with their wishes, nor did I consult them, and that it was by my advice Mr. Hogan did not consult them, and of course the trustees could not be responsible. Mr. Ashley then said, he hoped the responsibility would not rest upon them, but where it ought. I answered in the very words stated by Messrs. Ashley and Fagan, "Leave that to me, I will take all the responsibility from Mr. Hogan and the trustees." I was then asked, As I would not consent to officiate in the church on Sunday, and as Mr. Hogan, it now appeared, had determined not to officiate, would I address the people in the church on Sunday, upon this subject?" I stated, "either there or in some other convenient place, when it shall be necessary." Mr. Ashley remarked in substance, "That the trustees did not wish to take a thorn from Mr. Hogan's side, and plant it in their own;" and added, with a significant smile, "At all events, Hogan, you have drawn your neck out of the noose very dexterously." It must then be plain, that the trustees were under the impression that I made no pledge to supply St. Mary's with a clergyman, and that it was to them, and not to Mr. Hogan, that I, on the preceding day, stated that I would apply to you, as a particular favour, for leave to appoint one, though I had no hopes

of my request being complied with, and I redeemed this pledge by writing to you, Right Reverend Sir.

Messrs. Ashley and Fagan state that they waited on me "on Friday, to know what arrangement would be made, under existing circumstances, for the celebration of divine service on the ensuing Sunday; on which subject Dr. England deferred expressing his intentions until evening," (page 14.) Those gentlemen, together with Mr. Leamy, state in page 12, that on the preceding day I told them, "they might shut up the church." It must then be plain that I did not inform them on the preceding day, that I would officiate, or procure a person to officiate; but they state that I undertook to write to you for leave to appoint, and so forth. Why then call upon me next day, when they knew I could not have your answer? and why by my desire? The plain and full statement of what occurred will be the best explanation. Mr. Hogan having withdrawn without any stipulation with him for supplying St. Mary's Church, the trustees conceived they ought to try what could be done. Accordingly they instantly proposed their difficulty; to which I gave my answer. They calculated that I would have the power of appointment, and that, probably, before a week. Mr. Ashley stated, page 16, he had no doubt of my success—this conviction he expressed also on the preceding day. The entire difficulty was then reduced to this single point, Shall the church be closed on Sunday, or will any arrangement be made to have Mass? Not wishing hastily to decide, I stated that I would answer next day. After consulting the clergy, I was told you would not give me the power, nor be pleased with my saying Mass in St. Mary's. I wished to reconsider the case and declined answering until evening, to try whether the clergy would change their opinion. I found them continue unchanged. My determination and the opinion of the clergy were known in the evening, and then the trustees determined to procure Mr. Hogan's continuance.

In going with Mr. Hogan, subsequently to this conversation, to return the visit of Mr. Meade, who did me the honour of calling on me on Tuesday, I was asked by Mr. Hogan whether I would have any objection to Mrs. Ashley's attending my Mass at his house on Sunday morning, as he believed she would prefer assisting there to going to one of the churches. I stated that I had not, and that he might bring whom he pleased.

Finding my situation at the Mansion House extremely inconvenient, I requested that I might be directed to some private lodging, where my accommodation would be more suitable to my feelings. Mr.

Hogan pressed me to use his house for the few days during which I was to remain, and to sleep there that night. I consented.

Reverend Mr. Power accompanied me thither from St. Joseph's, at about half-past ten o'clock. Mr. Hogan was not at home. Mr. O'Hannan received us. I instantly observed him to be greatly agitated and dejected; and Mr. Power gradually brought him to acknowledge that he feared the trustees had prevailed upon Mr. Hogan to retract his promises to me, and to bind himself to officiate on Sunday. I said it was impossible he could consent. Mr. O'Hannan replied there was no use in deceiving me—it was a fact. I asked what could be thought of him after having acted so? His answer was, "You would not blame him if you saw him—no man was ever so beset and worried." It was now considerably after eleven o'clock, and though Mr. O'Hannan pressed us to stay, Mr. Power and I went out, declaring we would prefer walking all night through the streets to remaining there, and returned to the Mansion House.

Next day was Saturday, and Mr. Hogan neither sent to me nor came to me to inquire "who was to officiate on the next Sabbath morning?" nor did I reply, "shut up the church." But he sent to request an interview, and I answered, "If he be not disposed to do what is right, I do not wish to meet him—if he be disposed to act as he ought, let him leave the occasion of being tempted by those people—let him leave town and not return until Monday, and then I will see him and forget what he has done last night." I have been informed, I do not know how truly, that he was twice on the point of doing so, but was prevented. I know two of his supporters came to inform me that he was going, and to know would I speak to the people? I answered, that when he had left town, I would appoint the time and the place. At six o'clock one of his warmest partisans came to inform me that Mr. Hogan would not leave town, but would officiate next day. I then said, "I do not wish to add to his censures. By officiating he relapses into his former state—let him send me a request to release him from my jurisdiction, and I will comply with it—but let me have it in half an hour, and I will inflict no farther censure; but unless I receive it then I shall be obliged to issue an excommunication." I was told I should have it before twenty minutes. I waited four hours and a half, and at half-past ten at night Mr. Power and I called at his house; and Mr. Power served on him a formal monition, signed by me, directed to him as a priest of my diocess, not to officiate in a strange diocess in which he had no jurisdiction, and in which he was forbidden under censures to officiate, and declaring that if he disobeyed this monition

and mandate, he, by the fact, would incur major excommunication, and the power of absolving therefrom reserved to me; and in my presence Mr. Power, having burst into tears, put it into his hand, informing him also of its contents.

Mr. Power and I retired to the Mansion House, and about twelve o'clock Mr. O'Hannan, accompanied by the person by whom I had sent the message in the evening, came to me with the paper which I was promised to have at half-past six. I said it was now too late, the monition had been issued and received. I, however, kept the paper.

Next morning, Mr. Hogan was at St. Mary's Church, at an early hour. I said mass at St. Joseph's, after I had been informed that he celebrated at St. Mary's. I then breakfasted, and was waiting to preach, when I was handed the letter in p. 19, which is there dated October 20th, that is Saturday, whereas the original was dated on Sunday, 21st, and the ink was fresh and the wafer wet, and in place of asking me to "proceed to-morrow afternoon," as in the printed copy, the original asked me to "proceed this afternoon;" and the words possess ecclesiastical information, which are marked in italics, allude to a conversation which I held late on Saturday night, and which he could not have known before it was held, and the complaint against Mr. Cooper was for a conversation which he had after nine o'clock on Saturday night. All these are so many palpable proofs of the letter being written on Sunday morning. What can be his object in studiously altering it to Saturday, and changing its context to suit the change of date, I know not.

My answer was written the instant after I read the note, for in the original there was a passage which I did not find in the printed copy, stating that he was anxious to announce to his flock at mass, that I would address them on that evening. After what had taken place, I looked upon the letter to be intended as an insult; to which I sent the answer, p. 22. The letter from Mr. Hogan, of the same date, was given to me with the wafer wet, on the morning of the 22d, in Willing's Alley, at ten o'clock. I did not read it, as soon as I saw the commencement, but returned it to the messenger, remarking that I knew no pastor of St. Mary's.

I trust it will be seen from the documents and facts which the pamphlet of my accuser contains, that it must be evident I did not either lead Mr. Hogan or the trustees to believe, either that I would officiate, or procure a person to officiate in St. Mary's Church, unless in a case which I stated to be improbable, viz., your giving me power to do so; and next, that before I promised to do even that, Mr. Hogan

had, without any such condition being made, placed himself under my jurisdiction, and promised to obey me as his bishop; and that it was not in consequence of my not observing my promises to him, but in consequence of yielding to the trustees, that he declined fulfilling those solemn promises; and though I always, since I examined the case, was convinced that Mr. Hogan acted irregularly, I never then or now charged him with profligacy, because, though I have proof enough for the first charge, I have no proof for the second. But, I now repeat what I have before stated, that I was doing all I had promised to do, and he has thought proper, after acting irregularly, to charge me with being the person in fault.

It will also be perceived, that, to the last moment, I had not declined my intention of addressing the people as I had promised, though I was in doubt whether it would be proper for me to do so in St. Mary's Church. But, after Mr. Hogan had acted in direct opposition to my injunctions, and that at the solicitation of the trustees, I had little hopes of my address to the people being productive of any good effect; besides, the glaring impropriety of my appearing officially in the same church, with a person whom I had been obliged to excommunicate.

Your clergy told me, and I believe with good reason, that the consequence of my appearing in St. Mary's Church, would be, creating an erroneous impression, that I did not consider Mr. Hogan to have been validly excommunicated.

Tedious as I have been, I must address to you another letter, to explain some other passages of the pamphlet.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER III

CHARLESTON, Sept. 18, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Dr. Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—In my two former letters, I have explained those points of the Reverend William Hogan's pamphlet which principally regarded the transactions upon the nature of which you had a strict right to satisfaction.

Mr. Hogan has thought proper to place before the American public many other allegations which, if true, would very justly lower me in public estimation, and argue the impropriety of my retaining that place in the ministry with which I am charged.

I was, for some time, of opinion that, after having explained my conduct in Philadelphia, I should not have to obtrude upon the public; but I am otherwise advised, and it is suggested, that, having given a partial explanation, silence upon the other charges would, by many persons, be construed into an avowal of their truth. I shall, therefore, endeavour, as briefly as I can, to give the explanations which I consider necessary for my defence. Were Mr. Hogan and I in Ireland, I should not need to explain. The facts which he distorts are there well known, and, from the most virtuous and public spirited individuals, as well as in the public prints and at public meetings, I have repeatedly been complimented for those very acts upon which he demands my condemnation in this country. And I trust that, when they who have read his charges shall have read my statement, of public and notorious facts, I shall not appear so condemnable in their eyes as they may be at first led to believe I deserved.

The following are the passages which I shall first explain. I may not be able to review them all in the compass of this letter, but I shall exhibit them here:—

Page 7. "Probably the bishop dreaded he would injure his health by his attention to a party paper which he then edited, and to which he seemed to be then exclusively devoted; or, perhaps, he apprehended he would injure his lungs by haranguing mobs at elections for members for the city of Cork; or, peradventure, he had some reason to fear the world would be censorious enough to remark, that it was not the province of a clergyman however virtuous or talented, to edit any party paper, or to become the head of any electioneering mob."

"This young man, actuated, no doubt, by that generous ambition which always bespeaks a loftiness of mind not peculiar to all the sons of Adam, hearing that the Carolinas were constituted into a diocess, applied for the superintendence of them, and through the agency of some of his parliamentary friends, who never lose an opportunity of contributing to the happiness of America, obtained the appointment."

Page 19. "But our astonishment ceased when we recollected the editor of the *Southern Reporter*, author of sundry libels, for one of which he had been publicly, and according to law, punished."

Page 31. "You seem not to be acquainted with the progress of the human mind in this great and vast country; your long acquaintance with convicts, and cells, and gallows, might have enabled you to form accurate ideas of the base and more corrupt passions of the

human heart; but it appears you have never looked at the fairer side of human nature, or never seen the bright and progressive aspect which the human soul wears when it breaks through the fetters of slavery, and shakes off the encumbrances of ignorance, despotism, and superstition, as it has done in this country; otherwise, vain as you are, you would not dare to introduce amongst us, its inhabitants, the absurd and revolting doctrine of blind obedience and non-resistance."

Page 13. "It may be proper here to remark, that Dr. England, in going to the wharf, stated to Mr. Ashley, that from his knowledge of the Reverend Mr. Hogan in Ireland, he was perfectly convinced the report of his having been suspended in Ireland was as groundless as it was unprincipled."

They are reducible to the following charges:

1. That I edited a party paper in Cork, to which I seemed to be exclusively devoted.

2. That I was editor of the *Southern Reporter,* and author of many libels.

3. That I was publicly, and according to law, punished for one of those libels.

4. That I headed an electioneering mob in the city of Cork.

5. That I ran the risk of injuring my lungs by haranguing the said mob.

6. That all this was inconsistent with my duty as a clergyman.

7. That, having heard of the erection of the Carolinas into a diocess, I applied for their superintendence.

8. That I obtained the appointment through the interference of my parliamentary friends.

9. That my parliamentary friends never lose the opportunity of contributing to the happiness of America.

10. That I dared to introduce into this country the revolting doctrines of "blind obedience and non-resistance."

11. That I appear not to be acquainted with the progress of the human mind in this vast and great country.

12. That, from my long acquaintance with convicts, cells, and gallows, I am incapable of forming accurate ideas of freedom of soul.

13. A statement by Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan, that I stated to Mr. Ashley that, from my knowledge of Mr. Hogan in Ireland I was convinced the report of his having been suspended in Ireland was as groundless as it was unprincipled.

The first charge contains two statements. First, that I edited a

party paper in Cork; second, that I seemed exclusively devoted thereto.

Before I proceed to give distinct answers, I must give an explanation. A respectable friend of mine, at one time a most opulent bookseller in the city of Cork, and a most respectable Roman Catholic, is now, together with his two sons, whom I shall have occasion to mention, in this country, after having experienced great vicissitudes of fortune. This gentleman was half proprietor of one of the best-conducted and most profitable papers in Ireland,—*The Cork Mercantile Chronicle.* He became embarrassed. His partner in the newspaper stated that, as the failure occurred in the book department, and the paper, which was a separate concern, was flourishing, he would either sell his moiety for a stated sum, or purchase the other moiety for the same. A number of the most respectable and opulent Roman Catholics of the city, amongst whom were the former and the present bishops, and the former and the present deans of the diocess, entered into a subscription, and purchased one moiety from the partner and the other from the creditors, for the benefit of the family. They had two objects in view, one to save the property, the other to uphold the principles of the paper, and they wished to find a person to whom they could confide both: after considerable inquiry, they unanimously requested me to undertake, not the editing, which was then conducted by a very eminent lawyer, but the trust. I had two objections: one, I knew that as the paper was conducted upon the avowed principle of supporting civil and religious liberty, and as the trustee was liable for every line it contained—for, by the Irish law, he is the person punishable, whoever may be the writer—I would be exposed to the continued hostility of the attorney-general, who avowed that he was anxious to extinguish that print on account of its republican spirit, and vindication of Catholic rights; the second was, that I could not undertake it without the bishop's consent. The bishop having not only given the consent, but having joined in the request, I undertook the property as trustee for the two minor sons of my friend, as by the law I could be trustee only for minors, persons of age being themselves responsible. The paper was certainly, as might be seen from its files, a party paper, inasmuch as it spoke the sentiments of the friends of civil and religious liberty, who in Ireland are not the people, but a party,—and inasmuch as it spoke the sentiments of the Roman Catholics, who in that country are also a party. I was not the editor, but I frequently wrote for the paper before and after accepting the trust, and occasionally, in the absence of the editor, conducted the print. My associates in contributing to its columns were those men who still continue fearlessly, in Ireland, to

express those sentiments of which an American may be proud. If there be found in its columns during my trusteeship a single sentence favourable to despotism, or opposed to rational liberty, let me meet the abhorrence of every friend of freedom, whether in Europe or America.

The second part of this first charge is totally untrue, for during that period I successively held the following situations, all the duties of which I regularly discharged: the chaplaincy of the city prisons; that of the Presentation Convent of Nuns for the education of poor children; that of the Magdalen Asylum; the lectureship of the cathedral; the superintendence of the diocesan seminary, and teacher of philosophy and theology therein; inspector of the poor schools of the city, which contained upwards of two thousand boys; and secretary to the Fever Hospital; and was on the committees of several charitable institutions. Many of those situations I held together, and was during the entire period secretary to the diocess, and secretary to the Board of Examiners of Candidates for Holy Orders.

The first part of the first charge is then untrue in the sense which it was meant to convey to the public. The second part is altogether opposed to the truth.

The second charge is, I believe, in its first part, only a mistake of the name of the paper,—for my impression is, that Mr. Hogan knew nothing of the case but what he learned from some vague rumour. If he were acquainted with the facts, the Southern Reporter is the last paper with which he would connect my name, for it was a paper in the pay of the British government; and one of the duties assigned to it, was the abuse of the Roman Catholics who would not consent to barter the remnant of their liberties, and the purity of their religion, for pensions for the clergy, and eligibility to office for the laity; and as I was one of the most active in opposition to those destructive and enslaving measures, I saw myself exhibited, week after week, in the columns of the Southern Reporter, sometimes as a star, and sometimes as a cloud, sometimes as a madman, sometimes as a very Daniel. If, then, the *Reporter* contained libels, they were not mine. The second part of this charge distinctly states that I am the author of sundry libels. Was this assertion made by a person whom I would choose to appear against in any court of justice, I believe I could, in America, obtain a verdict against him as a defamer, unless he could show that I wrote more libels than one; but I shall be satisfied to lie under the censure due to a libeller, if either Mr. Hogan, or any other person, will produce one libel of my composition, or [in] which I was a participator.

The next charge is, that I was publicly, and according to law, punished for one of those libels. I pray your attention to the facts. In the year 1816 I was trustee for the *Chronicle;* in the paper of the 1st of April, 1816, the following paragraphs appeared:

"*Commiseration of a Landlord.* Whilst we feel gratified in recording the many concessions made in these calamitous times, by landlords to their distressed tenants, we cannot refrain, however painful the task, from the statement of an instance of an opposite nature, which our public duty compels us to notice.

"Within the last month, a poor tenant, not more than twenty miles distant from the city, had keepers placed upon him by his landlord for an arrear of rent, amounting to about £5. The tenant, unable to pay, shared, as an Irishman always will, his dry potatoes with the persons sent to prevent the removal of his little stock. The day of sale arrived, the landlord came upon the premises, the stock and furniture were set up and knocked down, and still the produce did not suffice to pay the arrears and cost. His little stock of provisions was sold, even to the bushel of potatoes. The wife of the tenants, surrounded by twelve crying children, ran in a distracted manner from her dismantled and dreary dwelling; the heart of the landlord could not resist the impression which such a scene was calculated to create, human feeling was not yet dead within him; he turned from these miserable objects, and declared, "upon his honour, it was a pity that one half of them were not shot!!!" and he departed, lest the delicacy of his nerves should not be able to withstand the impressions. Was all this done for the £5? No, reader, it was not! It was done for recovering the land. It is an exhibition of one minor transaction of that extensive system which has been the bane of Ireland. The landlord had but a residue of two years' interest in this ground, and the tenant had a demise for that period. The head landlord was known to be a nobleman who had determined to give a preference to the occupying tenant; and therefore the under landlord, or middleman as he is called, was anxious to have the land in his possession: and it was not for the £5 that the distress was levied, but for the purpose of driving the occupant from the land. But whither was he to be driven? or to whom was he to look for assistance? How were his children to be supported? We cannot answer these questions. This is one great cause which has driven the unhappy peasantry of Ireland to desperation. The owners of the estates are absentees,—the middlemen and the agents are generally good friends,—and the name of the occupier is not on the roll exhibited to the lord paramount, or if by chance his name should be

mentioned, he is, as we have known to be the case in one very extensive estate in this county, not long since out of lease, returned as a labourer or a cottager; and thus, ejected from their dwellings, driven from their homes, vagrants through the country, out-canted, and rendered penniless and hopeless—these unhappy persons enter into combinations which civilized society cannot tolerate, and must punish. But whilst we acknowledge the necessity of preserving order, let us shed a tear over the victim, and cherish the hope that the day may not be distant when the poor Irish slave may be protected by his landlord, and be allowed a small participation of the blessings with which heaven rewards his toil.

"In the case before us, a remedy has been, we trust, found,—because the agent, of the nobleman, upon whose estate this occurrence took place, was a man of humanity, and has interested himself on behalf of the wretched family; he had certified the statement of the poor man, who, by the contributions of his neighbours, has been enabled to proceed to London, to look for a renewal of his lease from the noble lord, and we have very little doubt that his prayer will be granted. We regret to say, that the mesne landlord is a clergyman. How unlike other reverend gentlemen, whose humanity we had occasion to applaud! They say he expects shortly to be decorated with the magisterial mantle. Want of space prevents our entering more at large upon this subject at present."

I never was believed to be the writer. Mr. Goold, who was the leading counsel for the gentleman who brought an action against the trustee of the paper, for damages in the Civil Court, at the trial, I copy the words from the printed report, "lamented that the reverend gentleman should be found sacrificing his functions, and in violation of his sacred office, his time, whether with the consent of the higher powers or not, to him was not known, but he found this reverend gentleman to be the responsible, legal proprietor of the 'Mercantile Chronicle;'" and again, "the plaintiff has no enmity to Mr. Enggland, and he equally admits that he is convinced that reverend gentleman neither had nor has any enmity to him. I believe they do not even know each other; but though he is convinced that Mr. England was not the author of the paragraph, and that he had no participation therein, still he holds Mr. E. accountable, if he will not produce the writer."

Mr. Quin was leading counsel for me; he answered one part of Mr. Goold's speech in the following words: "Gentlemen, Mr. England is the proprietor of this print in a very peculiar manner. My learned,

and I am always to add, my eloquent friend, Mr. Goold, stated something about the exercise of 'unprecedented functions' in public prints. Gentlemen of the jury, if the exercise of benevolence be unprecedented, if amiable benevolence be unprecedented, then my client has indeed been unprecedented. Gentlemen he has been, and he is the benevolent trustee of the respectable but unfortunate family of . . . He, gentlemen, as trustee for that family to that establishment, at the request of a number of the most respectable amongst his fellow-citizens, stands upon the highest ground of Christian benevolence." "Gentlemen, this is not a case, as Mr. Goold would have you believe, between two individuals; it is not founded upon a charge of malice; it is an action brought by an individual against the proprietor of a public print to whom no malice has been imputed, whom the very plaintiff acquits of malice."

"You will recollect also, that neither counsel nor evidence insinuated that the defendant had any intention to injure or to give pain to the plaintiff."

"Now, how does he prove his case? By bringing witnesses to prove that the transaction described took place between himself and his tenant; that it was known in the vicinity; that it was talked of, and then that it was inserted in the paper without the mention of names, without the designation of place, and that the moment it appeared the whole transaction was so accurately described, no person who knew the transaction could doubt but it was meant for him."

In the examination of the witnesses there were two defects fatal to the defence; the first, the words attributed in the paragraph were not spoken by the landlord, but by a person in his company; of course, the landlord upon this part of the case, should succeed. Next, the tenant who was the principle witness to support the allegations, repeatedly stated, that although all the facts of his case were described in the paper exactly, and that he read the paper, having been told that his case was described therein, and having sworn that the description was exact and accurate, yet he would not undertake to say, that the landlord and tenant described were his landlord and himself. The jury, who were twelve landlords, being special, declared their conviction that he perjured himself in this last statement. They, upon that ground, rejected his testimony altogether, and of course found a verdict for the plaintiff to the amount of one-fifth of his claim. This was the libel for which I was publicly, and according to law, punished.

I knew nothing of the facts, neither did the editor of the paper, and my consent was given to the insertion of the article, after I had

been applied to for the purpose, by a most benevolent man, who had no connexion with either of the parties, but who had learned the facts in the neighbourhood, and who pledged himself to me that he believed them to be true. The names were not mentioned to me, and I stated the conditions of insertion to be, that no individuals should be pointed out, and that it should be made a subject for giving a general view of the evils of Ireland, arising from the oppression of the industrious by the idle.

I could have withdrawn from the responsibility of the trial by the offer of the plaintiff, but I had been requested by the writer of the article, for whom I had the highest esteem, and who has since died in his benevolent attendance upon the sick, and who was the father of an amiable family, not to give his name, as the inconveniences that would arise from the uneasiness of that family, would be afflicting to him. I respected him too much not to comply with his request. Mr. Hogan knows a brother of his in Limerick, who is also a pattern of benevolence and patriotism. The testimony of their fellow-citizens, of every religious denomination, and of every gradation in society, has given to those gentlemen, a character well earned by their acts. For such men, engaged in such a cause, I should, at any time, be happy to volunteer my feeble aid. And at the trial, though he said upon the law he should decide against me, the presiding judge, Johnson, declared his concurrence in the following sentiments, expressed by my leading counsel, Mr. Quin:

"But, gentlemen, there is one matter, which, in despite of my learned friend, I must advert to and draw your serious attention to. Mr. England is proprietor—you have learned under what circumstances. It is an essential part of the political economy of every well-regulated public print, that all transactions bearing upon the public feeling, interest, or of national prosperity or adversity—that every transaction acting upon the interest, degradation, or feeling of a portion of the community, shall be observed upon and freely discussed, with energy and spirit, but certainly with temper and understanding; and it is for the benefit and very existence of society that such print so acts; and let me tell you, that the print neglecting to discharge so imperative a duty, deserves not the name of a public press. Such a press, so venal, betrays its own authority, the country, and the constitution. Under such a press crime will grow so big, so monstrous, as to shake the land to its centre; in such a case, it is only the free press that can show guilt in its deformity, make vice hide its head, and from the glorious transcendent emanation of an honest press, give vigour, and health, and

independence to the land. And if any subject in this country require the animadversion of the press—if any subject is capable of interesting the feelings of the great, the good, the wise, in this nation, it is the identical subject upon which this paragraph in question is the theme! All things are weak—every subject is minor to the high consideration of the happiness or misery, the comforts or calamities of that vast population, the 'peasantry of Ireland;' the high consideration of the relative situation of the governor and the governed, the union or disunion of landlord and tenant, the union and bond which link and tie in unison two relative parties, which cannot, by art, by stratagem, or by force, exist together, except in reciprocity of action, by the natural and reciprocal ties of generosity on the one side, and gratitude on the other. That happiness and peace can only have life and animation where the lordly master can feel the full impulse of generous sensibility, and never allow himself to indulge in a greedy, avaricious, and grinding oppression of the unfortunate cultivator of the soil. In this country, particular circumstances will occur between landlord and tenant, which, from a variety of causes, much as we must deplore them, still continue to exist; in all such circumstances, it is the duty of us all to lean to the side of the unfortunate peasant; and when such is the case, the grand object for the security and peace of the country is, that a mellowed system should be acted upon towards the peasantry, and which system can only have existence in the humanity of the landlord. Gentlemen, it is demonstrated to you that Mr. England received the paper in question—that he knew not of himself the parties—that it complained of gross, indecent oppression on the part of a rich landlord, and a clergyman, upon a poor tenant, a peasant, himself cultivating the soil which he rented, and which was now about to be out of lease—he inserted in under those feelings, and conceived he was only discharging a duty which the liberty of a press imposed upon him, namely, as a proprietor, to notice the intrenchment upon the rights of society in general terms, at a certain risk; he has done so, and he now stands in a situation to meet the charge and to encounter the risk."

The judge, in charging the jury, stated, "That although he must give it as his opinion that a verdict must be had for the plaintiff, yet he must urge upon their consideration, that it was evident there was no crime, no malice on the part of the defendant; and the only fault which he appeared to have committed, was that of too easily receiving the statement without sufficient scrutiny; perhaps he relied upon others for examination; on all hands it was agreed, the paragraph, so far as

the statement of alleged facts, did not originate in the office, and was published without ill-will. But, why not give up the writer? That neither I nor the jury can answer—perhaps the trustee of this paper ought not. It frequently happens, that it would destroy the sources of intelligence which a public print possesses, were they to be pointed out, besides the situation in which a trustee, stands regarding the property of others, is very delicate."

The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff, but even his own witnesses proved the statement, with the exception of the mistake in attributing the words spoken by one person to another, to be substantially correct.

From this statement, copied chiefly from the report of the trial taken down by shorthand writers in the court, and immediately printed and widely circulated, the value of Mr. Hogan's charge may be appreciated.

I know not what the public of America, who know not the system against which the paragraph was directed, may think of such a libel; but I know, that continuing the system to which it was opposed, has made Ireland the wretched abode of fever and famine, which it is to-day.

Whilst Mr. Hogan was indulging in pursuits more to his taste, I was to be found using my best efforts to avert the ruin which I foresaw, but which a host of greater and better men than I am could not prevent. I regret that the publication was so highly coloured—I regret its mistake in attributing to one man what was said by another—and I regret that the writer was not more guarded in his special description, to avoid pointing out an individual; but I was not the author, nor did I know the parties.

I have already swelled this letter too much. I shall close for the present, and resume the other topics in my next.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IV

CHARLESTON, Sept. 25, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—In my first two letters to you, I proved from Mr. Hogan's own pamphlet, that my conduct had been greatly misrepresented in his publication. I did not, at the period of writing these

letters, intend to go out of the pamphlet, and thus load the case with additional documents; but some of my friends who have seen the documents which I hold upon the subject, are of opinion that I would be guilty of great injustice to myself, were I not to exhibit them. I shall, therefore, comply with their wishes and defer examining the charges enumerated in my last letter, until I shall have exhibited those papers, the originals of which, I shall, if you require it, send to Philadelphia for your inspection and examination, and that of any other person who may desire it.

I stated in my second letter, that Mr. Hogan sent me a written application to be received into the diocess of Charleston, without making any condition for my supplying St. Mary's Church; and, that in my answer to his application, there was no such condition agreed to on my part.

Before my leaving Philadelphia, I returned Mr. Hogan's letter upon my receiving back my own, but the following copy was taken at the time:

"*To the Right Reverend Doctor England, and so forth.*

"*Right Reverend Sir*:—In order to facilitate the arrangements which you propose, for healing the wounds inflicted on religion in this city, I beg to inform you, that I shall retire from the diocess of Philadelphia, provided you receive me into that of Charleston: upon condition, however, that I shall have full leave to take such lawful and canonical steps as may be necessary for the vindication of my character, and the prosecuting before the See of Rome, such suit or suits as may be proper to obtain for me, or for the Roman Catholics of this city, such redress as the Holy See may judge fit to grant for the wrongs which we allege have been done to us.

"As to my publications and conduct, I only have to say, that I leave to the Holy See to judge and to decide upon both; and that after it shall have been made fully acquainted with the facts, I shall most cheerfully submit to its decision. Meantime, I shall be guided by you as my bishop in the future regulation of my conduct.

"I have the honour to remain, your lordship's humble servant.

"Oct. 18, 1821. WM. HOGAN.

"*Endorsed.*—Received from Reverend A. O'Hannan, October 18th, 1821, in Philadelphia with answer.

"This is a correct copy taken by me from the original.

"A. O'HANNAN.

"Oct. 20, 1821."

My answer, which was returned to me by Mr. Hogan's messenger, on the night of the 20th, was as follows:

"*To the Reverend Wm. Hogan.*

"PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 18, 1821.

"*Reverend Sir*:—I feel much gratified at the receipt of your letter, which Reverend Mr. O'Hannan has now handed to me.

"The conditions which you make are so reasonable, that I cannot object to them. Your submission to the Holy See is sufficient for me. I do think, that under all the circumstances of your case, it will be better to lay all the facts before that tribunal. Your pledge to abide by its decision, warrants me in exercising the jurisdiction which I have received from the Bishop of Philadelphia, upon the condition of your coming to my diocess, and that which I possess as delegate of the Holy See within my own diocess, where I hope soon to meet you.

"The details will be better arranged in an interview between us this evening. Meantime, I beg to say, that I have the authority of Doctor Conwell for your leaving his diocess. His consent, and your own wish both concurring, I now receive you as belonging to the diocess of Charleston, and trust that you will always find in me a bishop anxious to direct you in the discharge of your duties; and, from your several conversations with me, I anticipate your zealous co-operation with, Reverend Sir, your bishop.

"JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*"

It is plain, Right Reverend Sir, that when Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan, first conversed with me, which was after I had received the above application, and despatched the above answer, which I was closing when they came in, Mr. Hogan had retired from Philadelphia, and been received into Charleston, in the full extent of canonical usage; and this without any pledge "under my hand," or "from my lips," of providing a pastor for St. Mary's—without Mr. Hogan's stating it as one of the conditions, without obtaining which he could not retire. It is also plain, that these gentlemen, who were informed of the substance of these letters, saw that there was so such condition and, therefore, they sought to obtain it, and finding it impossible, they prevailed upon Mr. Hogan to remain in Philadelphia.

The next point to which I will draw your attention, Right Reverend Sir, is to Mr. Hogan's publication of my note in pp. 17 and 18. When I wrote my second letter, I did not intend to publish the documents which I now give; and finding that I could vindicate myself without exhibiting the variations of that copy from the original, I determined not

to notice the alterations which were made. I, therefore, only remarked upon what was a substantial error in the close of the second paragraph, and corrected its meaning after having merely looked to the substance, without having the document before me.

I shall republish Mr. Hogan's copy, and give the original. You will then observe the changes, and be at no loss to determine their object.

Mr. Hogan's alleged copy is this:

"Oct. 20, 1821.

"*Reverend Sir*:—You having agreed to the terms, which I conceived myself bound to make, to settle the differences now existing in the congregation of St. Mary's Church, requires on my part, a distinct recapitulation of the conditions I then proposed.

"You shall have a mission in my diocess, which I could not give you, did I believe you guilty of any of the charges advanced against you.

"You shall have my permission to go to Rome, to institute any suit or suits which you or the Catholics of Philadelphia may think proper, for the recovery of your rights.

"Should you wish to leave my diocess, you shall have my permission, with testimonals founded on a just view of your future conduct.

"You shall receive a salary of eight hundred dollars per annum, from whatever institution you may serve, or to which I may think fit to appoint you.

"I shall endeavour to place you and the Reverend Mr. O'Hannan as near to each other as possible, and the interest of my diocess will permit.

"JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*"

Copy from the original, and compared and agreeing with the copy taken by the Reverend Mr. Power on the spot, at the time:

"PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 19th, 1821.

"*To the Reverend Wm. Hogan.*

"*Reverend Sir*:—You having agreed to the arrangements which I conceive myself in conscience bound to make, for the restoration of peace to the congregation of St. Mary's, in this city, requires, on my part, a distinct recapitulation of the conditions which I proposed to you, and which I now repeat.

"1st. You shall have a mission in my diocess, which I could not

grant did I believe you guilty of the crimes with which you have been charged.

"2d. You shall have my permission to go to Rome for the purpose of prosecuting any suits, which you or the Roman Catholics of this city may institute before the Holy See, for any acts hitherto done, or connected with the late occurrences in Philadelphia.

"3d. Should you, at any time, wish to leave my diocess, you shall have my permission to do so, and testimonials of your conduct, founded upon a just view of your future behaviour.

"4th. Should I deem it prudent, and you feel it convenient to reside with me, or be otherwise employed by me for the service of religion, you shall receive from me, or from whatever institution you may serve, at the rate of $800 per annum.

"5th. Unless it should be, in my opinion, inconvenient to the service of the diocess, I shall endeavour to place you and the Reverend Mr. O'Hannan as near each other as possible.

"JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*"

You will observe, Right Reverend Sir, that in this genuine document I made no mention of his rights.

The next document is a sketch of my view of Mr. Hogan's case, together with my opinion upon that case, as stated by himself, which I drew up on the evening of the 17th, after having supposed the truth of all the assertions made against you by Mr. Hogan. I used it as a sort of memorandum to guide me in the advice I should give. I read it for Mr. Hogan more than once, on the morning of the 18th. I read it for Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan, on the 18th; and I read it for other friends of Mr. Hogan, on that and on the following day, dwelling upon and explaining its several parts and propositions, as I found necessary, to endeavour to impress upon them the propriety of being guided by the principles which it contained. I read it also for the Reverend Mr. Hurley, and I think some others of your clergy, and I believe for Mr. Carey.

It is a slovenly production, without form, because it never was intended to be exhibited. and was merely taken down to keep in view the train of reasoning upon which I gave my advice, supposing even that you were guilty of all the faults charged by your opponents; but I prefer publishing it in its unpolished state, to making even the slightest alteration.

"Principles upon which the divisions of Philadelphia can be healed.

"Statement.—Reverend Mr. Hogan has been censured by the bishop. His moral character has been aspersed. He denied the validity and legality of the censures. He officiated in the church of St. Mary's which was interdicted. He administered sacraments, aspersed the moral character of a number of clergymen in his publications, and denied the truth of the charges against himself.

"1mo. No person can be a judge in his own cause. Therefore, Mr. Hogan must either submit to the sentence of his bishop, or appeal to a higher legal tribunal. All other acts are injudicious, illegal, and destructive, even of a good cause, in every tribunal, civil and ecclesiastical.

"2ndo. The Bishop of Philadelphia is the regular ordinary; therefore, all his acts are presumed valid and regular, unless proved irregular and invalid, *coram judice*. The conviction of truth upon the mind of any individual, or number of individuals, is not proof *coram judice*. Therefore, the sentence must stand, even though there should be a conviction upon the public mind of its irregularity and invalidity, until it be set aside by the proper judge; and though the irregularity and invalidity should be proved to millions of persons, this proof will not avail, unless they be the regular judges: because the proof is *coram non judice*.

"3tio. The congregation of St. Mary's is not the canonical judge. The archbishop is, in some cases. The See of Rome can be in all. The archbishop is not now here; and even if he were, he has already refused to entertain the original question: and by one side is strongly suspected of being a party to the question to be tried. Therefore, Rome is now the only tribunal which can and ought to be appealed to for obtaining a judicial setting aside the sentence pronounced by the lower tribunal.

"4to. A person free from censure stands upon better ground in court, than an appellant under a sentence, the reversion of which he seeks. Therefore, Mr. Hogan should endeavour to place himself in that situation, without injury to his case, did he mean to go into court.

"5to. A person who, having acted injudiciously and illegally, ceases to do so, and expresses sorrow for his injudicious and illegal acts, stands upon better grounds in court, than one who continues those acts; those acts once committed, and not retracted, are in canon as well as in civil law, presumed to continue. Mr. Hogan's acts have, in many instances, partaken of both those qualities. Therefore, he should rectify this error, did he mean to go into court.

"6to. It is always better to appear in court as plaintiff, for an injury sustained, than as defendant to a cause. Mr. Hogan can complain of injury sustained, only when he has been obliged to leave what

he claims as his situation. He is virtually a defendant even in an appeal, whilst he still holds, even by force of the congregation, and the law of the land, that place which the bishop claims to be his by canon law: for judgment must be given by the canon law, not by American civil enactments."

From those principles, it must necessarily follow:

1st. That Mr. Hogan acted wrong, in assuming to himself to be judge in his own case.

2d. That he acted wrong in not submitting, *in foro externo*, to the bishop's sentence, until it should have been set aside by a competent tribunal.

3d. That this competent tribunal is either the court which inflicted the sentence, or its delegate, or its superior, *i. e.* the Bishop of Philadelphia, or his delegate, or the See of Rome.

4th. That it would be imprudent in Mr. Hogan to appear before the See of Rome under censures.

5th. That Mr. Hogan ought to discontinue his injudicious acts, by retracting his pamphlets: and his illegal acts, by desisting from the discharge of his clerical duties in the diocess of Philadelphia.

6th. That thus he will stand upon such grounds, in any suit for injustice, in which he may choose to be plaintiff, as will bring his case under far more favourable consideration than it could otherwise obtain.

Note upon the heads 3tio and 3d.—It must be remarked, that Mr. Hogan can, if he chooses, by one act, place himself in such a situation as would give jurisdiction to a delegate of the inferior court, viz., of the Bishop of Philadelphia, to do away all the effects of the sentence, except so far as the territory of the diocess of Philadelphia is concerned; and thus the necessity of an appeal to the superior court, viz., Rome, for removal of censures, would be rendered unnecessary: for in case Mr. Hogan withdraws from the diocess of Philadelphia, and places himself under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Charleston, the Bishop of Charleston as delegate *pro tanto* of the inferior court, will absolve him, in *foro externo*; and *interno*, so far as may be necessary, from the censures *ab homine*, inflicted by that court. And as the delegate of the superior tribunal, viz., of Rome, by virtue of special powers of delegation, which the bishop will exhibit, he will absolve from all irregularities and censures, inflicted *a jure*. Nor will Mr. Hogan be thereby prevented from the vindication of his character, in any mode he may think proper—nor from becoming a plaintiff before the See of Rome, for any alleged injury against the Bishop of Philadelphia, or any other

person; but, on the contrary, by doing this act, he will plainly stand upon better ground for all those purposes.

Messrs. Ashley and Fagan testify, page 14, enough to show, that I did use those reasons "in support of the advice which I had given;" but they indeed reduced the entire to this: "he mentioned" . . . "that the Reverend Mr. Hogan would have much greater advantages, by appearing as plaintiff against Doctor Conwell, than by acting as defendant; to obtain which advantage, it was necessary he should relinquish his present situation in St. Mary's Church." Perhaps those gentlemen thought my reasoning reducible to their statement. They also testify in the same page, that I stated Mr. Hogan was incorrect in officiating against your will in St. Mary's Church. Perhaps they thought the word incorrect was equivalent to illegal and invalid; for I repeatedly told them, that the acts requiring jurisdiction, such as absolution in confession, and the like, were all invalid.

I shall close this communication by exhibiting to you the copy which Mr. Hogan gives in his pamphlet, page 19, of a letter, which he states he sent me on Saturday, the 20th of October, and the exact copy of that which I received:

"Oct. 20th, 1821.

"*Right Reverend Sir*:—I regret the omission of a mere formula should prevent you from doing what you conceived would be of paramount advantage to religion. I have agreed to all your propositions, though some of them required the sacrifice of my rights and feelings. I only objected to the mode of complying with them, seeing that it would be detrimental to the cause of religion in general, and to my flock in particular, who, by such a mode of procedure, would be deprived of all the comforts of religion, and involved in the consequent miseries thereof. Should you, Right Reverend Sir, permit me, I shall mention to my congregation, that you will, as you have said, address them to-morrow afternoon, and restore them that peace they stand so much in need of. I shall have all things arranged for the occasion; of your success you seem to have no doubt. I do not presume to dictate to you,—but it appears to me that, in matters wherein the vitality of religion is supposed to be concerned, we should not stand on formalities. Were I to possess the ecclesiastical information of others, perhaps I should act differently; but possessing only what answers my purposes, and wishing to display it only for the good of religion, I have taken the liberty of again giving you my ideas on this subject; and assuring you, that in all our intercourse in this business, I only require the protection of my honour and veracity. Were my own interest alone concerned, I

should yield to your wishes; but the rights of a large and respectable congregation are at stake; and under such circumstances, could you require of me to leave them, without even wishing them farewell? Put your hand to your bosom, and ask yourself, whether you would thus leave a congregation who had protected you against the most villainous machinations; no, sir, you would not; it is not human nature, and religion requires not the total overthrow of humanity. Reflect, again, and again, I beseech you; and if you think well of it, proceed to-morrow afternoon to heal the wounds which, you say, have been inflicted on religion.

"Your Reverend Pastor, Mr. Cooper, actuated by his usual zeal, or, perhaps, under the influence of one of his periodical fanaticisms, is spreading over the city sentiments which I believe you never expressed. I wish you would discard such madmen from your society, and act from the impulse of your heart. Should you prefer an interview with me, I shall have the honour of waiting on you when or where you please.

"I have the honour to remain your humble servant,

"William Hogan."

Letter received by me, and copied without changing a letter, marked on the back in my own writing, on the spot, "Received in Bishop Conwell's house, at half-past 10 o'clock, on Sunday, October 21st, 1821. Answer immediately."

"*Right Reverend Sir*:—I regret the omission of a mere formality should prevent you from doing what you conceive would be of permanent advantage to religion—I have agreed to all your propositions, tho some of them required the sacrifise of my wrights and feelings; I only objected to the mode of executing them, seeing that it would be detrimental to the cause of religion in general and to my flock in particular, who by such a mode of procedure, would be totally deprived of all the Consolations of Religion and involved in all the consequent miseries thereoff.

"Should your Lordship permit me, I shall mention to my congregation that you will address them this afternoon for the purpose of restoring them, that peace they stand so much in need of. I shall have all things arranged for the occasion, of your success you have no doubt; neither have I. I do not presume to dictate to you; But it appears to me, that in matters, wherein it is supposed the vitality of religion is even locally concerned, we should not stand on mere formulas—did I posess 'the delicate sense of moral feeling or extensive ecleseastical information of others' I may think differently, But posessing only as

much as answers my purposes of both those qualifications and wishing only to make a parade of them for the benefit of my fellow creatures, I have taken the liberty of again giving your Lordship my ideas on this subject and assuring you that in all our intercourse I only required of you to protect my honor and verracity which you know have been pledged to my congregation—were my own interest alone concerned, I should submit to your wishes on this occasion, but the wrights of a large and respectable congregation, nay their eternal salvation is concerned, and under such circumstances could you require of me to leave them even without bidding them farewell? Put your hand to your boosom and ask yourself, whether you would leave a congregation who have protected me from persecutions of the darkest hue in such a manner. No, my Lord, your greatful and generous heart would spurn at it, it is not human nature, and the establishment of religion requires not the total overthrow of human nature. Reflect again and again I besiege you, and if you think well of it proceed this afternoon to heal the wounds, which imprudence, (not to say worse) has inflicted on our holy religion, I shall be no obstacle in your way. Your Rev'd. Pastor Mr. Cooper actuated by his usual zeal, and perhaps under the influence of one of his periodical fanatiscisms, is spreading all over the city sentiments which I believe you never conceived—this I can prove. I wish my Lord you would act from the impulse of your own noble and generous heart—let me conclude by assuring you again on the honor of a priest and a man, that the warmest wish of my heart is to promote the interest of religion, and that I am ready to make any reasonable sacrifise to accomplish it in this city. Should your Lordship wish an interview with me, I shall meet you when and where you please.

"I have the honor to be your humble servt.

"W. Hogan."

Mr. Hogan has, therefore, in this document, made serious alterations to suit the changes of date, which it was very material to preserve; because on the 20th, Mr. Hogan had done no act which would have induced censures. But, on the 21st, at the time of my receiving the letter, he was actually under a reserved major-excommunication, inflicted by myself. On the 20th, he had done no act which would have prevented me from addressing the people under proper circumstances; but on the 21st, his acts deprived me of the power of addressing them.

I do not complain of his suppressing the compliments which he paid to my heart, for I value equally his compliments and his reproaches. I shall neither be flattered by the one, nor feel pain from the other. He can neither bestow upon me the permanent brilliancy of a star,

nor the consumptive qualities of a meteor. But I do complain of any change in a document which forms part of a case submitted to public opinion. Such a change is unwarrantable.

Whether the document given in the 22d page as Mr. Hogan's note to me, be or be not a true copy, I cannot say, for I returned it unread. That given as mine is correct, except the date, which ought to be Sunday, half-past 10 o'clock." This is material.

In my next, I shall explain the succeeding charges made against me by Mr. Hogan. I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

Charleston, Sept. 25th, 1822.

LETTER V

CHARLESTON, Oct. 4, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—Allow me to continue my defence upon the charges made against me by the Reverend Mr. Hogan, in his pamphlet, and enumerated in the third letter which I had the honour of addressing to you. I have met the first three charges. I now proceed to the fourth, "That I headed an electioneering mob in the city of Cork." The fifth, "That I ran the risk of injuring my lungs by haranguing the said mob." And the sixth, "That all this was inconsistent with my duty as a clergyman."

To you, Right Reverend Sir, no explanation is necessary for the purpose of enabling you to judge of the nature of Irish elections for members of Parliament. But, for the public of America, to whom Mr. Hogan has denounced me as a mob leader, explanation is essentially required, because the elections there are conducted in so different a manner from the elections here; and the ground upon which the interference of a clergyman in the one place may be demanded, not existing in the other, the mistake arising from the difference of circumstances would, probably, lead to an unwarranted conclusion unfavourable to me.

The short history of facts, and these facts public and notorious, will be my defence.

In the civil war which raged in Ireland upon the accession of William III. to the throne of England, the Irish, who were principally Roman Catholics, and who had a powerful army, made a vigorous stand at the city of Limerick, which surrendered upon terms of capitulation, amongst which was a solemn guarantee to the Irish Catholics,

for the undisturbed possession of their property, the free exercise of their religion, and the full enjoyment of their civil rights.

No sooner had they laid down their arms than this treaty was violated by the King of England, who pleaded as his excuse, the refusal of its ratification by the English Parliament. The Roman Catholics of Ireland were plundered of their property, divested of their franchises, and persecuted with the most relentless cruelty.

After nearly a century of unparalleled sufferings, the Irish Catholics began to experience a little sympathy from some of their fellow-subjects, and a degree of commiseration from the English government, or, at least, the semblance of commiseration from its policy. Amongst their earliest, most strenuous, and unalterable friends, the father of the present Lord Donoughmore, Mr. John Hely Hutchinson, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, was conspicuous. He was then a member for the city of Cork. Mr. Hutchinson was succeeded by his son, Hon. John Hely Hutchinson, now Lord Hutchinson; and upon his promotion to the peerage after his conquest of Egypt, the Hon. Christopher Hely Hutchinson was elected in his stead. Every member of this family strenuously supported the claims of the Catholics, as well in the British as Irish houses of Lords and Commons.

In the year 1812, an Orange party was privately formed in the city of Cork, for the purpose of opposing the return of Mr. Hutchinson, or any other member of this family, to parliament, because of their support of the Roman Catholics; and because Mr. Hutchinson was considered by the party to be an admirer of republicanism, and an advocate for a reform of the corruptions in the British government. The party succeeded after a close struggle, and Mr. Hutchinson lost his seat because he had voted for Catholic emancipation. If Mr. Hogan were a Roman Catholic elector of the city of Cork, would he have felt no humiliation at beholding the representative of that family, to whose exertions he had been greatly indebted for regaining his right to vote, driven from the city for those exertions? If he would not, I do not envy his feelings. I was then a freeholder of the city of Cork, and of the very few Roman Catholics who was legally qualified to vote for a member of parliament. I had the honour of being acquainted with Mr. Hutchinson, and some of his family, and was informed by his brothers, the Hon. F. H. Hutchinson, and the Hon. Ab. H. Hutchinson, before the close of the election, which lasted seventeen days, that from a review of the votes given, and those expected, they had no doubt of their brother's defeat, and were convinced it was owing to the supineness of the Roman Catholics who could qualify, but did not qualify, that their brother was

turned out of the representation of the city; and remarked, that nothing could tend more to diminish the number, and to damp the ardour of their parliamentary friends, than to find the Catholics negligent in supporting the persons who had earned the hostility of the government, by their efforts to relieve a suffering people.

I must own, that my pride and my feelings were roused by the remarks, and I was struck by their force; and my spirit was still more excited when, upon going into the court to give my vote, I found every menial of the Castle of Dublin, who had the freedom of the city of Cork, from the dancing master to the cook, and so forth, sent down by the government to vote against Mr. Hutchinson. As an elector, I had a right to address the court if I thought proper. I was requested by many of my friends to do so. I did speak, not to a mob, but to as respectable an assemblage of electors of the city of Cork, as were ever together at one time. I was an elector of the city. I did not conceive I had lost my civil rights by becoming a clergyman. I was a Roman Catholic. I owed my right to vote, in a great degree, to the father of the man on whose behalf I spoke. I was a clergyman of that church for attempting to save which from persecution he was suffering. I thought I owed him support and gratitude. Swarms of Protestant clergymen had come to vote against him, some of whom had spoken against his principles. I held the principles which they attacked, and I was requested by my fellow-citizens to defend them. I did speak in their defence. If this be a crime, I am a criminal.

I feel abashed and humbled, Right Reverend Sir, at being forced to write the history of those acts in this country; but I am driven to those explanations by my assailant, in whose language I once was "the patriot" for those very acts. And as I am compelled to enter upon the topic, I will state, that when from my occupations of a more pressing nature, I was able to snatch a moment, I endeavoured to redeem the pledge which I on that day gave, that the friend of the Roman Catholics should not again lose his return whilst I could exert myself; and I did redeem it. The gentlemen with whom I was associated did place on the registers of the city upwards of 1200 Catholic electors, where there had not been before 200; and although the intolerant portion of the Protestants had the exclusive power of making freemen of the city, the liberal Protestants, united to the Roman Catholics, succeeded so far as to be able to send in from thenceforward two friends to religious liberty, as the city representatives. I had the honour of being, for some years, a principal of this association, of which I was the founder, and which consisted of some of the most wealthy merchants of the city,

some of the most enlightened professional gentlemen, and some of the most extensive landed proprietors of the county, and all the independent and liberal electors, and several friends of civil and religious liberty, who were not electors. Some of them indeed were poor in pelf, but they were rich in a commodity, the value of which Mr. Hogan probably can estimate. They had consciences and honour, which all the ecclesiastical trustees of America could not purchase.

From the nature of the situation with which they honoured me, I had frequently to address this body; but, thank God, my lungs have outlived the exertion, and are not injured. As I have been frequently complimented by the public thanks of the people, for what they were pleased to call my services, I can the better bear with Mr. Hogan's reproach. As my efforts have been successful, it is fit that my vanity should be checked by occasional rebuffs, lest I may forget my weakness; and in the celebration of my triumph I am sufficiently humbled, when I look at the companion by whose side I am placed, and from my own experience I applaud the wisdom of the ancients. However, I have two sources of consolation. Our opponents acknowledged, that whilst we firmly asserted our own rights, and subdued them, we avoided hurting their feelings, or exasperating them after their defeat—that, although we were victorious, we were not insulting. The other is, that for the performance of those acts, I did not omit the discharge of my duties, because I devoted to their performance only those hours which more polished and better educated gentlemen were accustomed to give to the sports of the field, and to other amusements not so incompatible, I presume, with the clerical character.

I trust, Right Reverend Sir, the people of America will consider that it was not unbecoming in a Roman Catholic clergyman in Ireland to manifest his gratitude to a man who, together with his family, have been the steady, laborious, and beneficent friends of the Roman Catholics—who have come forward in their behalf, at a moment when every one else held back or opposed them. That it was not unbecoming in an Irish Roman Catholic clergyman to give the support of his vote to an individual of that family, which greatly contributed to confer on him the power of voting. That it was not unbecoming in a Roman Catholic clergyman, at the request of a respectable portion of his fellow-citizens, to assume an active place in sending into parliament a friend to civil and religious liberty, who had been put out of his place for having maintained that no man should be persecuted for his belief, and that governors should not be permitted to infringe upon the rights of the people.

Those were my acts—I am yet to learn that they were unbecoming. They were performed under the view of two successive bishops, who governed the diocess, and who themselves aided, as far as they could, to promote the object for the success of which I laboured, and who both not only authorized, but encouraged me to the labour. But I ought to have recollected, Right Reverend Sir, that I am reproved by Mr. Hogan, who is a better judge of ecclesiastical propriety than all the bishops he has ever known.

The state of unfortunate Ireland is not like that of America. Here, although the Roman Catholic religion labours under several disadvantages, there is no state persecution, and hence the Catholic clergy are not called upon to interfere in state concerns. As similar causes to those in Ireland are not here found, similar acts would not here be regarded as becoming in a clergyman. Hence, too, what may be here unbecoming, was there justifiable.

The succeeding charges are: "6. That having heard of the erection of the Carolinas into a diocess, I applied for their superintendence."

Mr. Hogan is perhaps led by a general principle of human nature, which he cannot subdue, to make this untrue assertion. Man generally judges of other men by the criterion of his own disposition; and it is only by studying the difference of character, and making due allowance therefor, he is enabled to avoid the rash conclusions to which he is generally impelled by the delusion and fallacy of his assumptions. I shall not judge Mr. Hogan by his assertions; but I can assure him that, however he might have acted under similar circumstances, he has stated of me what was not the fact. I can assure Mr. Hogan, that my emigration was not an act of necessity—it was not a step which my own indiscretion compelled me to take. My departure, and my intention of departing, were matters of public notoriety, and I did not find it necessary to conceal either the time or the place of my embarkation. I might have remained at home, and was quietly and happily living in the midst of my family and friends, in a parish in which my income was twice as great, and my labour twice as little as those of my present situation; and the bishop of the diocess, who had twice before refused me leave to come to this country, and who had refused to comply with a written request of the congregation of the Propaganda in Rome, to the same effect, was concerting measures to promote me to the best situation in the diocess, and I knew the wretched system under which the Catholic clergy of the United States were placed, and the miserable compensation which was doled out for their services; so that, if under those circumstances I did apply for the superintendence of the Caro-

linas, it must be allowed I did not act from motives of interest. I am not a person who has deserted a flock that treated me with kindness, to exhibit in a more fashionable city; but when I was retiring canonically, I introduced my successor to my former flock, and saw their wants supplied before my departure. Neither did I receive their money for services which I had not performed, and withdraw before the expiration of the time for which I had been compensated. Under these circumstances, I cannot perceive why Mr. Hogan should lay so much stress upon my applying for the superintendence of the Carolinas.

But what is the fact? I never did apply—but I was applied to. Two years before the erection of the diocess of Charleston, I was applied to for the purpose of learning whether I would allow my name to be placed upon the list of volunteers for foreign missions, in the office of the congregation of cardinals *de propaganda fide* in Rome. I consented, with one restriction, viz., "except for a British colony." The Bishop of Cork, about twelve months afterwards, informed me that he had some reasons to believe there was an intention of requesting me to go on some foreign mission, as he had been required by the cardinal prefect of the congregation *de propaganda* to make a report of my qualifications—that he had answered the demand, but hoped I would remain at home. Some of my friends, who had been in Rome subsequently, informed me that they saw my name on the list, and that a resolution had been entered, to suffer it to lie aside until an appointment in a republic should be necessary, in consequence of remarks upon my political principles. Soon after this, application was made to Rome for the erection of new diocesses, and the appointment of bishops for a portin of the United States; and I had actually been named for Charleston, before I heard that Charleston was to be erected into a see. The first intimation I had was a letter from Rome, representing the Catholic Church in America to be in imminent danger of extinction, from the uncanonical usurpations of the laity in several places, and the unprincipled conduct of a few of the clergy, who, in place of upholding the discipline of the church, misled the people and involved them in schism, and requesting me to recollect my offer of service, and prepare to set off for Charleston, to the government of the church of which I had been appointed—that the documents were expediting through the necessary formalities, and would be quickly transmitted, and that it was expected I would be ready instantly to act upon them.

Mr. Hogan, who had no opportunity of knowing any one of those circumstances, thought, I suppose, it would tell something in his favour to make the assertion, and to create a prejudice by the insinuations

which, with equal want of truth, he has linked to the principal untruth.

His next charge is, "That I obtained the appointment through the interference of my parliamentary friends."

This is not a random shaft, and if I be rightly informed, has not been shot by Mr. Hogan. I have many reasons for thinking that a man of more ability than Mr. Hogan fights in Mr. Hogan's name. A young gentleman, who is more expert in the field, has assumed his place, and combats in his armour. That, however, makes nothing for the truth or falsehood of the charge. The question is not, "who makes it?" but "is it true?" It is not true. From the statement which I have just given, its falsehood must be apparent. My parliamentary friends! Indeed, they are easily counted up. I have moved in too humble a sphere of life to have many friends or acquaintances in the British Parliament. I repeat it—Mr. Hogan never knew me, does not know my history, even now he does not know me—our acquaintance has been too brief. In both houses of the British Parliament my acquaintance does not extend beyond twenty or thirty members of the Lords and Commons, and of those perhaps I go the full length when I call one-fourth of them my friends. When Mr. Hogan penned his assertion, he perhaps thought to flatter that vanity by which he knows I am so completely swayed; but I have been humbled, I shall resist the temptation, for if I have reason to be proud of some of my acquaintance at the other side of the ocean, I have reason to blush for at least one new acquaintance I have made at this side; I shall not then be cheered and elated by the music of "parliamentary friends."

Unfortunately for the truth of the statements of my new acquaintance, the very few parliamentary friends whom I had, used their utmost exertions to prevent my emigration, and in those efforts they were joined by my own family, and my other friends; but, when I give pledges, I am in the habit of redeeming them, and my answer was, "that although I had every objection to the climate of the Carolinas, and had no ambition to contend for the principles of church government with self-sufficient individuals, who neither knew in theory, nor exhibited in practice, the principles of the religion which they professed, sometimes without believing, and sometimes without understanding; yet, as I had volunteered to place my services at the disposal of the Holy See, I would accept the appointment."

But, what could induce Mr. Hogan, or his substitute, to invent this fable of the interference of members of the British Parliament, in the appointment to American bishopries? Of course I can only form a conjecture, and judging from the conduct of the party by which Mr. Hogan

is employed, I find a very obvious motive. Those men who profess to be Roman Catholics, have uniformly endeavoured to overthrow the Roman Catholic Church government. I have read the tirades of the principal opponents to our religion against our clergy. I have known the virulence of the worst spirit of persecution in the British dominions; but, in all that I have read or known, I have not found a spirit more hostile to Catholic Church government, than the spirit which animates an infidel of the modern school, or what is called an American, independent Catholic. There is, in almost every other opponent, a feeling of decent forbearance—he may condemn you and openly oppose you, but the infidel and the pretended Catholic will profess to belong to the church, will endeavour to obtain dominion over its clergy, and claim to be its governor and protector, at the very moment that he despises its ordinances, ridicules its observances, derides its practices, mocks its ceremonies, and denounces its most ancient and venerable solemnities as unbecoming superstitions. Those men, unable to reason justly, and careless of truth, lay hold upon the public prejudices of our separated brethren, to enlist them on their side, and hence they endeavour to raise against us the feelings of a people who are justly jealous of their liberties, by insinuating, that some of us are the minions of a body, whose dominion they flung off because of its injustice. And they wish to have it believed, that the head of the Roman Catholic Church makes appointments to the American sees, to gratify the members of the British Parliament. And those men say they are Roman Catholics!!! But, as their statements are untruths, their expected conclusions must vanish. The American people will examine testimony, discover evidence and become acquainted with the truth. If Mr. Hogan will prove the truth of any of those charges which I have rebutted, I shall consent, during the remainder of my life, to be placed on the same level with a person who could deliberately publish palpable untruths, garbled documents, and mutilated statements, as the correct testimony of the acts of a person to whom he once professed friendship and gratitude.

The ninth charge is, "that my parliamentary friends never lose the opportunity of contributing to the happiness of America." Of the truth or falsehood of this I can give no opinion. I know neither their opportunities nor their contributions to the happiness of America. But, on behalf of those gentlemen, I thank Mr. Hogan for his kind notice of their merits; and on behalf of America, to which I feel a strong attachment, and for whose prosperity I have been always interested, I thank those friends who never lose an opportunity of contributing to

its happiness. But I must confess, that notwithstanding Mr. Hogan's respectable testimony, I am not quite convinced of the fact.

I shall trouble you, Right Reverend Sir, with some farther explanations in my next. I remain, your obedient, humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VI

CHARLESTON, Oct. 14, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—Much as I have intruded upon you, and upon the public with my defence, I still feel myself forced to continue the examination of the charges brought against me by the Reverend Mr. Hogan.

His next charge is, that I dared to introduce into this country, the revolting principles of "blind obedience and non-resistance."

Much of the apparent difference of human opinion would vanish, Right Reverent Sir, could words and phrases be invented, which should convey to the human mind only the same or similar impressions; but one of the inconveniences of our present situation, is the imperfection of language. The same set of words, even to persons using the same language, do not convey always the same idea to the same person, nor similar ideas, at the same moment, to different individuals. Did Mr. Hogan, or his substitute, vouchsafe to inform the public, in the first place, what they meant by the principles of blind obedience and non-resistance, the charge would be intelligible. Did the writer next specify the time, and the place, and the matter, and the manner of my guilt, I might be able to come forward, and demand an acquittal upon disproving the statements. But I am allowed no such opportunity: the whole charge is expressed in these words—"Otherwise vain as you are, you would not dare to introduce amongst us, its inhabitants, the absurd and revolting doctrine of blind obedience and non-resistance."

To the charge of vanity I plead guilty. I am sorry for it, and for many other faults to which I am subject. But, as I stated in my last, I have been humbled, and my humiliation ought to pacify my opponent were he generous. I have been placed by the side of Mr. Hogan, and knowing him as I now do, my vanity has received a most severe and salutary check. But when, or where, or how I did dare to introduce the absurd and revolting doctrine of blind obedience and non-resistance amongst the inhabitants of this country, I am at a loss to learn. To

this charge I plead "not guilty." I have not yet the honour of being a citizen of the United States, but I forfeited my freehold rights in my native country, to become a citizen here. I stripped myself of privileges which I actually possessed, and subjected myself for five years, to the inconvenience of undergoing a probation in a strange country, before I could regain there equivalent to what I had at home. Yet, I do not claim, on account of that sacrifice, to be preferred to a person who had no such sacrifice to make. I have never, since the moment of my arrival in the country, intermeddled with its politics; and the only paragraph which I ever wrote upon the subject, was contained in my first address to my flock.

"Your past conduct, and what we have learned of your dispositions, leave no doubt upon our mind, of your devotion to the interests of the state, and of your determination to fulfil your duty as citizens. You need not our exhortation on this head. But do not deem it presumption in us, who have not yet the honour of being an American citizen, to have adverted to the topic; for were it necessary, it would have been our solemn duty to call upon you for the preservation of the public peace, and the maintenance of those liberal institutions by which you are so well protected: for we are the minister of the God of Peace, who has placed the sword in the hand of the governors for the good of society. And we have for a long time, admired the excellence of your Constitution; and being desirous to behold your eagle grow in strength and beauty as his years increased; whether he rested in majesty upon the basis of the wisdom, the moderation, and the fortitude of your government; or lifting himself on the pinions of your prosperity, and surrounded with the halo of your multiplying stars, fixed his steady eye upon that sun of rational freedom which culminates for you as it departs from the nations of the East."

I am greatly in error if this contains "the absurd and revolting doctrine of blind obedience and non-resistance." Perhaps Mr. Hogan does not wish American citizens to be under the necessity of preserving the public peace, and maintaining their civil institutions, whilst those institutions afford sufficient protection. I must confess I do wish it, and I consider it equally their duty to obey the government, whilst it fulfils its part of the social compact, as I consider it their right to change the mode of government when it becomes injurious, or oppressive, or inefficient, and to remove the governors when they become unjust, tyrannical, oppressive, negligent, or incapable; but, whilst I admit those rights in the body of the people, collectively or in convention, I am far from allowing, that every individual who imagines the governor

to be unfit, or the government to be bad, a right to disobey the laws of that government, or to resist their execution by that governor. An individual has a right to appeal to the rest of the community; and if he succeed in convincing them of the correctness of his views, together with them he has his share of the right which belongs to the body, but not to the individual. But, if that community maintain the government, and support the governor, this individual ought to obey the law, or to depart from the nation; and if compelling the individual to remain quiet should he stay, and advising him, in such a case, to obey the authority of the state in which he resides, and not to resist its laws, be teaching the doctrines of blind obedience and non-resistance, then am I guilty. The principles here laid down are the basis of my political creed.

Those principles have with me been unchanged. I profess in America what I professed in Ireland, and what they who were my associates in Ireland still profess. I may indeed say with truth of myself, what was said not exactly in the same meaning of others, Cœlum, non animum mutant, qui trans mare currunt. I have not in America changed nor dissembled a single principle, either political or religious, which I have cherished. The political principles which I held in Ireland may be easily known from the facts mentioned in my last letter. Obscure as I was, Mr. Hogan knew them before he came to America from public testimony, for they were publicly known in Ireland. When I came to America, Mr. Hogan knew them, not from the paragraphs of papers from the southern states of America, for at the time Mr. Hogan wrote his pamphlet, in which he called me the star, and the patriot, and the divine, and the scholar, and the gentleman, and all the other fine names, no paper in the southern, in the northern, or in the middle states of America, had "inserted a puff to please him," page 5, except a few extracts from Irish papers, which appeared once in an evening paper of this city, soon after my arrival. Nor was it "those puffs which elicited the above eulogium," page 5; there was a more natural cause for flattery. But vain as I was, thank God, I was not allured by his bait. The newspapers in Ireland, some of those in London, and other parts of England, long since have published the political principles of the insignificant individual, the value of whose politics to the world is poor indeed. But still valueless as they may be, he has testimony of what they were.

On the 30th of August, 1813, an attempt was made, in the city of Cork, by some agents and expectants of the British government, to prevail upon an aggregate meeting of upwards of ten thousand Roman

Catholics of the county to adopt the principles of blind obedience and non-resistance, and, amongst others, I was one of the successful opponents to the measure. Mr. O'Connell, and a few others, and I, exerted ourselves and defeated the union of government agents and aristocrats, who combined against the people. Nor were the people ungrateful. I can still exhibit the address with which I was presented by them, and the chalice with which it was accompanied by the Roman Catholics, when a large and most respectable deputation of my fellow-citizens, appointed at a meeting of "the friends of civil and religious liberty," did me the honour of waiting upon me at the seminary which I then governed, to thank me. I shall not load my letter with the address, but I give you the inscription of the chalice—"*Rev. Johanni England, donum Civium Catholicorum, indefessum ejus erga Patriam fortunatumque laborem, admirantium. Corcagi, Agusti die 30ma, 1813.*"

When I was leaving Ireland, I received, in my own parish in Bandon, from the friends of civil and religious liberty, a public dinner, the president at which was a Presbyterian, and one of the vice-presidents a Protestant of the Church of England, and several of the gentlemen who attended were of other persuasions. They kindly added a valuable piece of plate, with a suitable inscription, as a testimony of their regard for me, not so much as a clergyman, but as a friend to my country.

In the city of Cork upwards of one hundred and fifty of my fellow-citizens did me the honour of giving me a public entertainment, after my consecration, and to which some of the richest and most independent and public-spirited members of other religious denominations subscribed, and at which they attended. The chairman was instructed to inform me that it was meant to compliment me, not so much as a clergyman, but as a friend to civil and religious liberty.

After leaving home my countrymen did not forget me. I received the following letter in due course from the highly respectable chairman of the Roman Catholics of the county in which I lived:

"Cork, April 20, 1821.

"To the Right Reverend Doctor England, Bishop of Charleston, S. C., and so forth.

"*My Dear Lord*:—As chairman of a most numerous and respectable aggregate meeting of the Roman Catholics of the county and city of Cork, held at Carey's Lane Chapel, in this city, on Monday the 2d instant, I have the honour of transmitting the subjoined copy of a resolution, adopted by that meeting unanimously, and with a degree of enthusiastic acclamation which it would be difficult, if not impossible, to convey any idea of by words. With the feelings of Irishmen your lordship, I am persuaded, is already well acquainted; and never were those feelings more warmly or unequivocally exhibited than in the manner in which your name, and this well-earned tribute to your past exertions in favour of Ireland, were

received upon that occasion. Counsellor O'Connell, who proposed this resolution, prefaced it by a glowing and beautiful panegyric on your lordship's public and private character, and your patriotic exertions in the cause of civil and religious liberty, which was among the happiest efforts of his powerful eloquence, and was alike honourable to his head and heart.

"I regret my utter inability to do justice either to Mr. O'Connell's speech, or to the feelings of the meeting at which I had the honour to preside; but I cannot conceal the sincere and heartfelt pleasure which I experience in being selected as the organ of making this communication; and I trust your lordship will do me the justice to believe, that in unabated admiration of your powerful exertions in favour of your native country, whilst residing on this side of the Atlantic, and in fervent wishes that success may attend your future labours in the cause of religion and humanity in the free and forunate land of your adoption, no individual at that meeting participated more warmly and sincerely than, my lord, your lordship's devoted and very sincere and obedient servant,

"THOS. STEPHEN COPPINGER."

The following is a copy of the resolution of the aggregate meeting:

"That the chairman be requested to convey, in the warmest manner, to the Right Reverend Doctor England, our unabated admiration of his patriotic and powerful exertions in favour of Ireland whilst amongst us, and our fervent prayer for the success of his endeavours in the cause of religion and humanity in the free country where he now resides."

My fellow-labourers are the acknowledged friends of civil and religious liberty, and no fact has been adduced to prove that I have changed my principles. Upon those grounds I assert the charge to be unfounded. To principles of blind obedience and non-resistance in civil and political concerns, I have always been an opponent. Did I attempt to introduce them into the country it would be, on my part, inconsistency which would be despicable, and high treason to the state, for which I ought to be punished. I unequivocally state that the charge is as devoid of truth, as it is of even the shadow of grounds for its support. In Ireland I have been treated with a propensity to republicanism. In America I am charged with introducing the principles of blind obedience and non-resistance. I have lived longer in Ireland than in America, and was better known in Ireland than I am in America.

But, perhaps, my religious principles were those to which Mr. Hogan and his deputy alluded.

My religion is strictly Roman Catholic. I am not taught by that the doctrines of blind obedience and non-resistance, neither have I taught them.

You know, Right Reverend Sir, what are our principles—allow me for an instant to examine them. The Roman Catholic religion gives me the following simple maxims for my guidance:—1. That I am a

creature, and consequently bound to obey my Creator. 2. That I have an understanding which I am bound to submit to that Great Being, by believing, upon his authority, what he reveals to me, though the nature of the proposition which he reveals should be above my comprehension. This obedience I call faith, and this faith must be founded upon evidence, not of the doctrine, but of the fact that God has revealed it, and this evidence is to be established by testimony. 3. That I have a will which is to be submitted to the law of God, of which law I must have evidence, but which evidence must also rest on testimony. 4. That when I have sufficient evidence of God's revelation and law, I am bound implicitly to adhere to them, and to observe them. 5. That although this evidence be founded on human testimony, still the obedience is paid not to human, but to divine authority. 6. The Roman Catholic Church exhibits to me evidence that her doctrine has been revealed by God, and that her code of morality has been given by God; that the general rules of her discipline were given by God, and that he gave authority to the body of the Apostles, and to their successors, to the end of the world, to regulate the special observance of those general principles, by special laws adapted to the circumstances of time and place; and I have evidence that the successors of those Apostles are the bishops of the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore, when I teach that we are to obey the authority of the successors of the Apostles, I teach only what God has taught, and obedience to God is not what is generally understood by "blind obedience," because it is the duty of the creature to obey the Creator. Neither is it teaching "the doctrine of non-resistance" as it is generally understood, to teach that man ought not to resist God; or if teaching those doctrines be what Mr. Hogan means by blind obedience and non-resistance, I plead the truth of the fact; but the absence of guilt in the action, because obedience to God is no crime nor absurdity, nor is this doctrine revolting to reason, though it may be revolting to pride, and to infidelity, and to ignorance; and it is a doctrine which I would dare to teach anywhere, because it is truth, and of course it is reason.

But it is intimated that I told Mr. Hogan to submit, and blindly to obey and not to resist. If Mr. Hogan was to be believed in other parts of his pamphlet, Right Reverend Sir, I told him you should submit and be turned out with disgrace, and that he was to resist and to triumph, and not to give up his rights. Now, if I told him all this and still preach blind obedience and non-resistance to this same person, what must be the value of my intellect? However, I must not allow myself to be an inconsistent blunderer because Mr. Hogan chooses to

write a pamphlet of contradictions, forgeries, calumnies, and falsehoods.

The doctrine which I preached to Mr. Hogan, and to his employers, was submission to the regular tribunals of the church, and if they conceived they were aggrieved by one tribunal, to appeal to another. The greatest democrat in the Union would, in a temporal concern, give them the same rule—"Bring your case into court, and if you think this court has injured you, appeal to the next." Suppose in place of appealing one of the parties revolted; and whilst he professed obedience to the state, actually turned the judge out of the court, denied his power, abused and vilified him and his supporters, by writing indecent, scurrilous pamphlets, and still professing obedience, made use of physical force to overturn the decisions of the court, pleading that an appeal was troublesome and expensive, would it be teaching blind obedience and non-resistance, to tell this outlaw, that in place of violating order and decency and law, he ought to come regularly into court and abide the decision of his case, and prove by his acts, that his declarations were not those of a designing hypocrite? But if in place of doing this, this man were still to say he knew law better than the judges, and he knew his case was so good, and the law was so plain, that he did not feel it necessary to go into an appeal, would it be preaching blind obedience and non-resistance, to say that the conduct of such an individual was incorrect, illegal, and outrageous? If Mr. Hogan, or his abettors, had, upon the most trifling case that could come before an American court of justice, gone the twentieth part as far in bringing into operation the principles by which they are actuated, as they have done in the ecclesiastical cause with which they have troubled their city, they would, long since, have felt the gripe of that power, which in every state is necessary to guard the public administration of law from being thwarted by individual or private discontent and insubordination.—There is no tryanny in stating the facts, that Christ left an authority to govern his church, that the successors of the Apostles are the depositaries of that authority, that they alone have the power of deciding upon church concerns, and the principle, that they who drag such decisions from that tribunal to lay tribunals, act as inconsistently as the persons who would drag civil suits before the tribunals of bishops. Such things have been done by common consent, where there was a union of church and state. In this country, thank God, they have been separated—the church has no authority in state concerns, neither has the state in church concerns. The duty of every good citizen, is to obey the authority of the people, who are the source of power in temporal concerns; and to obey the positive manifest authority of God, the only source of

spiritual power in church concerns. This is what I have taught, and shall continue to teach; and in doing so, I feel myself warranted by the evidence of truth, and the constitution of the country.

The next charge is, "that I appear not to be acquainted with the progress of the human mind in this vast and great country." Then I should be taught; perhaps Mr. Hogan would have the kindness to be my instructor. I shall, however, venture to suggest what I do know. I have travelled over a much greater extent of the states than Mr. Hogan has done. I have not merely run through, but sojourned in seven of the states, and been in two or three others. In those states I had the honour of meeting with the first society; hence, I do know a little more than may be at first imagined. I have conversed with and observed those in the more humble as well as the most elevated classes. My communications have been with the native and the settler. My teacher will probably have only to correct my notions, not to extend my research. I shall now state those notions. I believe the human mind is not caused to progress by the vast extent of the country. I do not know any greatness of the country that causes a progress of the human mind. There was as genuine republicanism in the little commonwealth of St. Marino in the papal states, as in any one at this side of the Atlantic. Rome and Greece were small; yet in them the human mind made progress. Did a native American write about the progress of the human mind in this vast and great country, I would forgive him for the little vanity to which we are all subject. When a stranger writes it, I am inclined, perhaps uncharitably, to suspect he wishes to gain some point with the American, by flattering that vanity. Now, my opinion is, that the emigrant here is just the same, as to the progress of his mind, that he was in the country of his birth—that the native Americans have a creditable spirit of investigation, a love for truth, an accuracy of reasoning, and they generally unite in themselves two qualities, which are rarely found united in the same individual elsewhere, a just discrimination of character, and slowness in expressing an opinion of their neighbours, especially if it be unfavourable. And although, as a body of people, they have more general information than perhaps any other body of people, they are, by no means, exempt from the common imperfections of human weakness; and much of the mist of religious misrepresentation which their English ancestors hung round the colonies still dims the lustre of the states, though it must necessarily be dissipated by the power of the great principle of religious liberty, which they have nobly established. From this view, I am inclined to think that America is a country in which the human mind is free, though

but partially cultivated; but, though their desire for improvement is great, and the progress has been considerable, I am of opinion it would have been more, but for flatterers who told them the Americans have outrun the rest of the world.

I did hope that I should be able, in this letter, to conclude my explanations of these charges, but I find that in justice to myself I must resume them and trouble you again.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient, humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VII

CHARLESTON, Oct. 18, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—The next two charges are easily disposed of.

"12. That from long acquaintance with convicts, cells, and gallows, I am incapable of forming accurate ideas of freedom of soul."

I avow that much of my time was spent amongst convicts, and it would be strange if it were not, because I, during nine years, was chaplain to the prison in which those unfortunate beings were confined, after having been brought to the city of Cork from all parts of Ireland for transportation. I, therefore, did spend much of my time in cells and in dungeons, and in the holds of prison-ships, and had frequently to attend the wretched victim of offended justice, and sometimes the victim, the innocent victim of a mistaking jury, at the gallows. But in those scenes of human wo and affliction and endurement, I was led to deep contemplation and to profound research. I may perhaps be in error; I have known and conversed with the persons who figured in a court, and I have frequently made a very rapid transition from listening to the story of the weeping captive, and teaching him how to prevent the galling of his chains upon his body and his soul, and mingling my tear of sympathy with his tear of grief, to the scene of festivity and enjoyment, where innocence and mirth exhibited themselves in the faces of some, and in others care or guilt showed through the deceptive veil which had been flung over them; here, as well as in my ordinary intercourse with society, have I learned to estimate human nature, and to form my ideas of the human soul. Had the writer of the charge known the sensations experienced by him who consoles the afflicted, he never would have written as he did. From my soul, I believe no Catholic priest could have penned the paragraph. It cer-

tainly was not Mr. Hogan. He could not, if he ever did his duty as he ought, and that he sometimes had, I am inclined to believe, by the side of an afflicted and dying Christian, receiving the consolations of religion, and, aided by them, triumphing over pain, and misery, and death, he could not ever have written so foul, so false a charge. True freedom of soul exhibits itself most under the pressure of affliction. The pagan poet, the ancient philosopher, the recorder of the Godhead, the Christian martyr, the suffering saint, whether innocent or penitent, the experience of the world, are all, all in opposition to the thoughtless, unfounded assertion of the pamphleteer.

I shall not call into question his knowledge of the world, of the clergy, and of canon law. He is kind enough to find a standard by which mine is to be estimated. Addressing me, he writes: "Your age is about thirty-six, mine about thirty-two, and supposing an equality in every other respect, it is more than probable the difference of our education, in our juvenile days, and since our entering the church, the nature of our avocations would make a balance in my favour, and leave me as well acquainted with the world, theology, and canon law as you, venerable and (if you will have it so) aged prelate."

I am quite incompetent to give an opinion upon the comparison, for many reasons; but a principal one is, that I have not the honour of knowing the manner in which Mr. Hogan was educated in his juvenile days, though I have Mr. Hogan's own avowal for the extent of his knowledge, previously to his coming to America, because he informed me in New York, that he had indeed never looked into canon law in Ireland, but that he had made a great proficiency in the study in Philadelphia. On the same occasion, he complained much of the time which he had lost in Ireland, by neglecting to study, but he had now redeemed it by close application. Of course, this application was directed by very proper and well-qualified teachers.

I shall yield to Mr. Hogan the palm for knowledge of the world, for knowledge of theology, and for knowledge of canon law, before I will yield to him, or to any other person, those feelings which I experience at recollecting my dungeon scenes, and my conversations with the convicts; or before I will yield the pleasing delusion which I cherish, that in those places, which the pamphleteer would avoid as degrading, I have learned more than in any other schools, and in which, if I possess any sentiments of religion, they have been greatly strengthened; and I would unhesitatingly say, that in those chambers of affliction, I have met with many who would not envy even Mr. Hogan, his peace of soul, or his freedom of spirit.

"13. A statement by Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan, that I stated to Mr. Ashley, that from my knowledge of Mr. Hogan in Ireland, I was convinced the report of his having been suspended in Ireland, was as groundless as it was unprincipled."

This, Right Reverend Sir, though brought forward by me at the close of the preceding charges, is that which astonished me the most, and is to me perfectly inexplicable. Mr. Hogan says it was "sworn to in court." Impossible! There must be some mistake. It is impossible that either of these gentlemen swore to such a statement. I have shown that other documents have been changed by the publisher of the pamphlet. I should sooner believe this was also changed, than that either of the gentlemen swore to a palpable falsehood.

I never knew Mr. Hogan in Ireland. Mr. Hogan, I believe, never knew me in Ireland. I have a distinct recollection of having told Mr. Ashley so, and surely Mr. Ashley is not so stupid as to mistake, "I never was acquainted with Mr. Hogan until I met him in New York, about five weeks ago," to mean, "from my knowledge of Mr. Hogan in Ireland, where I have not been for the last twelve months, and where Mr. Hogan has not been during the last two or three years, I am convinced the report of his having been suspended in Ireland, was as groundless as it was unprincipled."

I knew nothing material of Mr. Hogan at the time. I have since, from Ireland, learned facts which I did not then know, and had I known those facts before I had the honour of Mr. Hogan's acquaintance, neither the public, nor you, nor I would have been annoyed with my explanations to-day.

I never did then make the statement in the charge, nor do I believe it was sworn to by any of the gentlemen named above.

I shall endeavour to conclude my explanations in another letter.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient, humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER VIII

CHARLESTON, Oct. 25, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—Having explained Mr. Hogan's charges against me, I shall trouble you with a few additional observations upon the pamphlet, and supply a few omissions.

In the first place, p. 13, Messrs. Leamy, Ashley, and Fagan, stated

that I informed them, at their first interview with me, "that now all impediments relative to sacraments were entirely removed." They state the truth. I did inform them that the impediments were then removed, and at the time they really were, though they subsequently recurred.

What were the impediments? The schism of the Rev. Mr. Hogan and the adherence of the schismatics to him. The interview took place on Thursday, October 18, after Mr. Hogan had sent me a written promise of leaving Philadelphia, provided I would receive him into Charleston, and I had received him into Charleston, and did not imagine he would break through his promise. The schism being, therefore, considered by me as at an end—I stated the impediments relative to the sacraments were then entirely removed, distinctly not meaning that Mr. Hogan could administer them, but that the other clergymen would not now refuse them to those that had adhered to him. And I, as plainly as words could convey this meaning, did convey it to the gentlemen; for I told them, that no clergyman would now refuse to admit those who had previously gone only to St. Mary's to sacraments in the other churches, upon their applying with proper dispositions, and Mr. Ashley distinctly understood me, for he remarked that he was of opinion many of the people would not so trouble those other gentlemen, since they could not receive the sacraments from Mr. Hogan.

You will observe, however, Right Reverend Sir, that from the manner in which this expression is thrust into the context, the meaning is absolutely changed; and this is not the only sentence of that description so placed; there are many other propositions in the compilation which standing alone or coupled with the proper circumstances, would convey truth to the mind, but being thrust out of their places and connected with that to which they do not appertain, create false impressions upon the reader. This is the most culpable species of deceit because it is the most imposing, and exhibits a degree of deliberate, cool, determined intention to mislead.

The statement of the sub-committee was, "that those who entertained opinions favourable to Mr. Hogan were in fact now excluded from sacraments in all the churches of Philadelphia except St. Mary's," in order to show the necessity of having a clergyman in St. Mary's. My answer went to show this cause did not render the appointment necessary; because the schism being terminated by Mr. Hogan's leaving Philadelphia, "all impediments relative to the sacra-

ments 'in other churches' were now entirely removed." But when Mr. Hogan revived the schism the impediments were also revived.

The second remark I shall make is upon what no stretch of my charity, which I suppose will therefore be accounted very limited, can cover as a mere mistake. In almost every production which has come forth under the name of Mr. Hogan, or from any of his supporters, the usual pretext was that, according to the canon law as it now stands, he and his adherents were right, and all their opposers wrong. They wanted only to have the law carried into execution—they wanted no change; but it was stated that their opponents, whether stars or fools, knew nothing; ignorance, malice, tyranny, folly, and so forth, were their characteristics; Mr. Hogan and his learned friends were the only canonists. "Messrs. Binney and Sergeant, who are considered ornaments to their profession and to the city," were to be overturned by those inexperienced young men, who knew the written law so well that they could immediately produce it upon every occasion. The written law, the law as it was written, and nothing but the written law for them. One would imagine, Right Reverend Sir, that we were opposing law in opposing those gentlemen. Let us take one instance of their conduct. Speaking of the mode of appointing bishops, what is their own declaration? P. 8. "The salutary mode of appointing bishops by the suffrages of the people or clergy of each diocese having been long since exploded."

Thus the pamphleteer acknowledges that for a long time the salutary mode of appointing bishops by the suffrages of the people or clergy of each diocess has been exploded. Of course it is not now the custom. It is not now the law. Then the American bishops are not the first intruders, nor the only ones. Now, I would ask, is there a Roman Catholic bishop in the whole world, lawfully appointed? and I assert there is not a Roman Catholic bishop in the whole world who has been elected by the suffrages of the people, nor one in the whole world who has been appointed by the suffrages of the clergy of the diocess. They are all appointed by the Pope; though he may sometimes voluntarily bind himself to make the appointment in a particular way, still the right is in him:—and when the bishops were at any time or in any place appointed otherwise than they now are, it was not by any right then in existence which does not now exist, but by virtue of a permission then given, which is now withheld; and the reason why it was withheld was the same which any person observing the situation of Philadelphia during some years would acknowledge to exist there in full force. The dissension, the contention, the animosity, the tumult,

and the breach of peace, both in families and in public, produced thereby—and hence, the indulgence was withdrawn because it was found not to be salutary; but the tribunal which has the right of appointment, that is the Holy See, is open to receive the recommendation, or to the remonstance, or to the protest of any individual or body, whether civil or ecclesiastical, and will attend to all their remonstrances and recommendation, though without allowing them any right of dictation.

But what would appear strange to any person not knowing the tissue of contradictions of which falsehood is composed, is, that those writers should in the same breath almost assert that they are convinced a peculiar mode of appointing bishops has been long since exploded; and also assert that the bishops of America are not bishops of America, because they are not appointed by the exploded mode.

One good gentleman in Philadelphia, who wrote more pamphlets than one upon the subject of the present schism, had the kindness to assert that you were not Bishop of Philadelphia, because you were not appointed by the people or clergy, but only by the Pope; and he produced canon law for it too, but he forgot to read the 8th canon of doctrine of the 23d session of the Council of Trent, which expressly condemns his proposition as heretical.

It would be rather difficult for those gentlemen to point out the people of the diocess who appointed St. Paul by their suffrages, or the clergy of the diocess that appointed St. Patrick by their suffrages. We would be equally at a loss to know whose suffrages raised St. Augustine to a bishopric in England, or St. Denis to govern the church of Athens. We do, indeed, find an instance of the election of a bishop in America, and of the very first bishop; but it was granted not as a right, but as a special favour; not to form a precedent, but for that time only; not as a general rule, but as an exception, and by him who had the power of appointment in whatever way he thought most salutary. What sort of election took place for the appointment of Dr. Carroll? How far were the laity concerned therein? In no way whatever. Let any person look to the bull of Pope Pius VI., published in the 16th number of the Miscellany, on the 18th of last month, and see who were the electors and by what right, and who was to have the power of future appointments and upon what ground.

First, the bull states that to preserve men in "the evangelical truth delivered by Jesus Christ, support must be given by that heavenly authority which is entrusted to the Catholic Church as a steady pillar and solid foundation which shall never fail." The denial of

this proposition is a denial of Catholic faith, not because it is recited in the bull, but because it has been testified by the church in every age and in every nation, to be one of those principles derived through the Apostles from our Saviour.

The document next states in what that authority consists: "Now this charge of teaching and ruling, first given to the Apostles, and especially to St. Peter the prince of the Apostles, on whom alone the church is built, and to whom our Lord and Redeemer entrusted the feeding of his lambs and his sheep, has been derived in due order of succession to bishops, and especially to the Roman Pontiffs, successors of St. Peter and heirs of his dignity and power." The denial of the entire or of any part of this statement would for the same reason be a denial of the Catholic faith.

Two facts are stated in the first part of the document to which it is now necessary to refer. The first is doctrinal, the denial of which, therefore, would be a denial of Catholic faith. "That the Lord has imposed upon the Pope the duty of feeding and ruling his flock in the different regions of the earth." The second is upheld by the assertion of His Holiness, and it is at least no crime to believe it: "That his care and solicitude were particularly engaged that the faithful of Christ who, dispersed through various provinces, were united with him in Catholic communion may be governed by their proper pastors, and diligently instructed by them in the discipline of evangelical life and doctrine."

The next fact stated, is the wish entertained by the Catholics of the United States to have a bishop. Next his coincidence with that wish. Next that he proceeds to carry this joint wish into effect "according to the rules of the sacred canons." Next he commissions the congregation of cardinals *de propaganda fide*, to examine and to make their report to him. Next, they made their report, in which they advise that the priests then in America should be empowered to advise together and to determine first where the see ought to be erected, and next who ought to be the bishop.

One remark will suffice here. If the canons gave those priests the power of making the election, they had no need of being empowered by the Pope; but the congregation of cardinals recommended that they should be empowered to do that which otherwise they had not power to perform.

The next fact is, that the Pope, according to the recommendation "for the first time only, and by special grace, permitted the said priests to elect, and to present to this apostolical see." Then it recites

the facts, that "in obedience to that decree," and not by any other right, "the aforesaid priests" did assemble and did fix upon Baltimore as the site for the see, and the Reverend John Carroll as a fit person to be the bishop, and sent the necessary testimonials to the cardinals of the congregation *de propaganda fide*.

The bull continues to recite the fact, that the congregation made their report to the Pope, through Cardinal Antonelli, their prelate, in which they express their opinion, that the establishment of this new see, and the appointment of Dr. Carroll, will be beneficial to religion, and the Pope's determination in consequence. His Holiness then proceeds to his act of jurisdiction, and "by the plenitude of his apostolic power," not by the authority of the laity or clergy of America, nor by the authority of the cardinals, but by that which, as successor of St. Peter, he received from Jesus Christ, "he did erect the aforesaid town of Baltimore into an episcopal see for ever"; and proceeding, "according to the rules of the sacred canons," "for one bishop to be chosen by the Pope in all future vacancies." The bull then continues the recitations necessary for the special communication of power, and necessary to authorize some other Catholic bishop to consecrate Dr. Carroll.

Now either Pope Pius VI. knew the canon law of the church which he governed, and the cardinals knew it, and they acted according to those canons, or they acted in opposition to them. Yet we perceive, all through the recitals, that no reference whatever is made to any share which the laity had in the transaction, beyond their perhaps joining in the original wish, that there should be a bishop in the United States. Neither did the clergy act from any canonical right which they possessed, but in virtue of a permission which they received, "by special grace," and "for that time only." However, Right Reverend Sir, this dilemma is not perfect in its logical accuracy, for there is an alternative. They might have been ignorant of the canon law, and they might have been better instructed had they been aware of the existence of the Philadelphia University, in which any person may obtain a diploma of *utriusque legis doctor*, and a commission to receive appeals in all ecclesiastical causes, and to decide upon them summarily and without farther appeal, even against bishops and archbishops, upon paying the small fee of two dollars yearly towards the support of St. Mary's Church. So that amongst the other blessings of this free country, we shall soon, I trust, find flocking to our shores, students in canon law from every nation in the globe, the time, and the labour, and the expense of obtaining a degree in canon law in

America being so much less than in any other nation. The *corpus juris canonici* being now in fact wrested equally with the Holy Scriptures from the monopolizing grasp of proud, and petulant, and vain, and ignorant, and domineering, and illiterate, and pompous, and arrogant prelates, and having been subjected to the inspection and interpretation of the poor and the rich, the learned and the unlearned, men, women, and children of this vast and great country, in which no person can be enslaved, and in which it is the glorious privilege of every person to judge, and no person is so degraded as to be judged by another; except, however, always the regular civil and criminal courts, in which this privilege is restrained to a few individuals, and withheld from vast multitudes, and in which, notwithstanding the glorious principles of our constitution, the many are obliged to submit to the decisions of a few individuals who, strange as it may appear, are even provided with the means of compelling the multitude by force to submit to their dictation, though they will not permit any of the multitude, many of whom are, perhaps, wiser than themselves, to give even their advice as to the manner in which this decision is to be made; and what is more extraordinary, the very person who is most concerned in the decision, will not be permitted the privilege of embodying his friends in sufficient numbers to turn the judge out of the court, and to decide his own case as he thinks most convenient.

By this bull also, "according to the rules of the sacred canons," "till another opportunity should be presented to him, of establishing other Catholic bishops in the United States of America, and until other dispositions should be made by the Apostolic See of Rome, the Pope declared, by apostolical authority, all the faithful of Christ living in Catholic communion, as well ecclesiastics as seculars, and all the clergy and people dwelling in the aforesaid United States, though hitherto they might have been subject to other bishops of other diocesses, to be thenceforward subject to the Bishop of Baltimore in all future times; and to this bishop, and to his successors be imparted," by apostolic authority, "power to curb and check, without appeal, all persons who may oppose or contradict their orders—to visit personally, or by deputies, all Catholic churches, to remove abuses, to correct the manners of the faithful," and so forth. Those are amongst the special enumerating of episcopal ordinary power, as "regulated by the canons;" and whenever a bishop is appointed as an ordinary, he receives exactly similar power.

In the year 1808, that same Pope did "establish other Catholic bishops in the United States of America," following the same regula-

tions of the canons, and thus he restricted the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Baltimore, as to extent of territory, but his dignity was elevated by his being created an archbishop. Amongst the bishops then created, was the Right Reverend Doctor Egan, for the new diocess of Philadelphia. Now will the clergy or laity of Philadelphia assert, that they were the electors of your predecessor? It is evident that he was appointed by the Pope, as you were, as I was, as every Roman Catholic bishop in existence was. Though the mode of recommendation in different places be different, the right of appointment in all is exactly the same. They are all appointed by the Pope. If then this be the law and the custom founded upon that law, and that those gentlemen only desire to be guided by the law of the church as it is, will they deny that you are, by law and by fact, Bishop of Philadelphia? Will they deny that it is part of your ordinary power, derived from the Apostles, to curb and to check, without appeal, one of the clergy subject to you? Or will they assert, that the power of your decisions upon the exercise of spiritual authority within your own diocess, respecting your own clergy, is vested in Messrs. Ashley, Leamy, Fagan, and their associates? They acknowledge that you have been appointed in the ordinary way, consecrated validly, recognised by your metropolitan and the other bishops of the province, as being legally and properly Bishop of Philadelphia, and of course recognise in you the ordinary power of Bishop of Philadelphia, and yet deny you the right of exercising that power. To uphold this contradiction is one object of the pamphleteer. I shall endeavour to exhibit more of his objects in my next.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient, humble servant and brother in Christ, JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER IX

CHARLESTON, Oct. 31, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—As I am about to close the remarks in vindication of myself, I may now be permitted to recapitulate the principal charges which Mr. Hogan has been pleased to bring against me; and those persons who have taken the trouble to read my defence, will be enabled to form their decision. I repeat again, that so far as my own individual feelings are concerned, I should never have troubled myself, or you, or the public with giving a line in my exculpation. But I did not think I could, in justice to the Roman Catholic Church,

allow the public to continue under the impression that if I were the notoriously unprincipled villain painted by Mr. Hogan, I should, notwithstanding, be continued in the responsible and elevated situation to which I have been raised in that church. I may be unworthy of the trust reposed in me, I may want the virtues befitting my station, I may not have the same literary qualifications as Mr. Hogan. Upon those grounds, and many others, I may be totally unfit for the place, to fill which I have been selected. I feel its difficulties, and in many instances my own incompetency, and am ready immediately and unhesitatingly to surrender it to that authority which alone can receive my resignation, and place another in my stead; and when the competent authority shall find a substitute, and relieve me from occupying a post of privation and annoyance, I shall retire into private life with much more satisfaction than I felt at having been brought into public life. But whilst I am in charge, I shall endeavour to do my duty; and one of the first parts of that duty is not to suffer my office to be disgraced, by allowing it to go abroad without contradiction, that the Roman Catholic Church places therein the very refuse of society. It is not my province, neither am I competent to pass judgment upon myself. I have not done so, neither shall I attempt it. But I have been accused publicly in print, and in a public print I have given the facts upon which a correct decision might be founded; they who take the trouble of examining can decide. Mr. Hogan assures me, page 33, "that in Philadelphia I can never acquire the character of an upright man, or acquit myself of the charges brought against me." In the same page he tells me, that he "knows not whether I possess sufficient power of face to attempt acquitting myself of those charges he has found me guilty of." For, "there are some, when they find themselves sunk in public estimation, cease to make any efforts for the recovery of their characters, and endeavour to persuade themselves and others that the world is beneath their notice." He then informs me, "that the strongest proof which I could give of my good sense would be to say that Philadelphia and its inhabitants, their opinions of me, and the charges he has proved me guilty of, are beneath my notice." I have, I must confess, been frequently tempted, as I am here, to take notice of his ignorance of the meaning of English words; but I did and do feel it beneath my notice, as I never should enter into a contest with Mr. Hogan about words,—and whether he writes correctly or incorrectly is not the question under examination.

I shall take his charges in his own words, page 33. "They hailed my approach with joy, they welcomed me with enthusiasm, they con-

sidered me as a man of honour and veracity, a gentleman, and a scholar." Yet Mr. Hogan and his associates knew then as well as they do now, that "I had a long acquaintance with convicts, and cells, and gallows." Mr. Hogan knew then as well as he does now, "the difference of our education during our juvenile days, and since our entering the church the nature of our avocations." Mr. Hogan knew then as well as he does now, the splendid opportunity which was afforded to one of us, of being better acquainted with theology and canon law, by his having been expelled from college before he had read half the usual course which is gone through by the ordinary students in Ireland.[19] Mr. Hogan could tell then as well as he can now, how favourable to the acquirement of the theological and canonical information are the sports of the field, and the enjoyment of the social board. "But the course I pursued, the treachery I have been guilty of towards Mr. Hogan, and towards you, Right Reverend Sir, my manifest disregard for truth, and manifest want of Christian charity, my various contradictions my evident unacquaintance with church history and canon law, accompanied with the most unparalleled vanity and self-sufficiency, left a different impression on their minds." "But their astonishment ceased when they recollected the editor of the *Southern Reporter,* author of sundry libels, for one of which I had been publicly, and according to law, punished." Yet they knew all this when they considered me to be "a man of veracity and a gentleman."

Page 25. "I must be frequently under the necessity of reproaching the Right Reverend editor with a want of truth, and a departure from every principle which should actuate the Christian or govern the gentleman. However, I beg to assure him, that I shall do it in the mildest manner which the nature of the case will admit of, and pay the highest deference to his feelings and station as a prelate."

Page 1. "I am prepared to show . . . how destitute the Right Reverend editor of the Catholic Miscellany is of Chris-

[19] "The Rev. W. Hogan, late of St. Mary's, of Philadelphia, went through a part of his course at Maynooth; he was expelled in 1814, before he received priesthood. Having mentioned the name of Mr. Hogan, it is but fair to say a few words of his collegiate career. In 1841, I was a student in philosophy,—he was in the second year of theology. The dean, in his rounds, found him and one of two more in a student's room (where a second person was not permitted to enter) with a bottle of wine. The president was bound on oath to expel any one who violated the rule incurring expulsion. He accordingly pronounced Mr. Hogan, and so forth, expelled. Mr. Hogan protested his innocence, and declared that he did not partake of the potation: his case was referred to the trustees at the next meeting of the board. They restored him on condition of making a public apology for the scandal given. He would not apologise, and of course was obliged to leave the college."—A Maynooth Student.

tian charity, how inconsistent, and finally how regardless of truth."

Page 8 contains one instance, many others of which may be extracted from the pamphlet of "his deference to the station of a prelate." "The young clergyman soon had the honour of having a mitre on his head. Now his desires were satisfied, and his hopes crowned. No sooner was this new ornament placed upon his head, engraved upon his ring, seals, snuff-box, cane, tea-pot, coffee-pot, sugar dishes, and all other portable articles, than he takes his passage to Belfast." The truth is, a bishop does wear a mitre on his head in the discharge of some of his duties; his seal of office must have its proper emblem, and of course I have conformed to what I had no choice in adopting or rejecting; but Mr. Hogan must have intended to pay great "deference to my station as a prelate," when he added all the other accompaniments quite in contradiction to the fact. It is true I wear a ring, but in doing so I have no option; I am under the necessity of conforming to a custom established throughout the Christian world from the earliest ages; and the subject of even canonical regulation, by which bishops are required to wear certain indications of their office, which are forbidden to the other orders of the clergy; and Mr. Hogan's deference to my station as a prelate" shall not prevent me from conforming to the canons and the customs of the Roman Catholic Church. And in page 21 he writes, that he expected his "letter would have allayed the rancour which for some hours seemed to have taken exclusive possession of the prelate's bosom."

Another instance may be seen in page 38, which is as false in the insinuation, as it is wanting in "deference to my station as a prelate." "The gentleman alluded to is the venerable Doctor Carberry, formerly of Norfolk, a gentleman who is old enough to be grandfather to this mitred youth, and vituperative editor,—a gentleman whose gray hairs should unnerve the arm, and unstring the tongue of the most vindictive coxcomb, whether clothed in purple or otherwise." I regret, Right Reverend Sir, that gray hairs cannot produce the effect which Mr. Hogan desires, for then you would not have been assailed. The editor of the Miscellany has already stated, that the paragraph to which Mr. Hogan alludes, was not intended for Doctor Carberry, with the colour of whose hair I am totally unacquainted; and page 19, "I knew he was naturally quick and petulant," and liable to "hasty ebullitions of passion."

But to return to his charges—page 6, "I am prepared to show, from under his own hand, and from his own lips, that, by his public and private calumnies against me, he is guilty of the most irrecon-

cilable inconsistencies, and the most shameful departure from truth."

Page 8. "I shall, in reply to his private and public calumnies, show his inconsistency, shifting prevarications, and total disregard to truth."

Mr. Hogan's charges, in which he states that he has "treated me in the mildest manner which the nature of the case would admit, and paid the highest deference to my feelings and station as a prelate," are before the public; his object was, to prove that, in my conduct with regard to his case, I was guilty of inconsistency and falsehood. My explanations are now, too, before the public. I trust they will be convinced that, whatever my other faults might have been, they will acquit me of having been guilty of double dealing, which is criminal inconsistency; from that inconsistency which is the weakness of nature, and an imperfection without criminality, I claim no exemption. I trust they will perceive, that in my explanations I have proved, by the testimony of my opponents themselves, that I was not guilty of falsehood, from the pages of Mr. Hogan's own pamphlet.

If I have preserved truth and moral consistency, I trust I may be allowed to associate with gentlemen: and though my charity does not lead me to close my eyes against what I consider to be glaring irregularities, and tacitly to approve of what my office requires me, under peculiar circumstances, to condemn, I trust I may be allowed the appellation of a Christian.

I have not volunteered my interference in the concerns of Philadelphia. You, Right Reverend Sir, have more than once asked me to come forward. In passing through Philadelphia your clergy renewed the request. Mr. Hogan followed me to New York, and promised me that he would abide by my decision, and requested I would examine his case. "And pursuant to a resolution of the board of trustees, a committee from their body waited upon the Bishop of Charleston, on Wednesday, the 17th of October (they ought to have written Thursday, the 18th), at the Mansion House, to present him the respects of the trustees of St. Mary's Church and solicit his good offices for settling the differences existing therein," (p. 11.) And I am still under the impression, that if Mr. Hogan were left to act from his own judgment and feelings, he would have followed my advice. I conceive it but justice to him to state, that whilst I was engaged in endeavouring to accommodate this unfortunate schism, Mr. Hogan always spoke to me as he felt, and that he was guilty of no deceit; but he was the slave of circumstances, and absolutely under the dominion of the oligarchy, who are the true authors of the schism. And if Mr. Hogan had firm-

ness enough to be led by the decisions of his own mind, his emancipation from a slavery, under which he still groans, would have been effected by one act of energy on the night of Friday, the 19th of October, 1821. He had the weakness, contrary to my advice, to attend on that evening a meeting of the trustees; and I do acknowledge, that to resist such men under such circumstances required a very extraordinary degree of fortitude. Though I must condemn his conduct, I feel for his situation. I cannot, I would not answer for my own conduct were I circumstanced as he was; but though I lament his misfortune, I must not betray my duty.

Mr. Hogan has done wrong. The editor of the *Catholic Miscellany* has only done his duty, by exposing the weakness of the schismatical case. Mr. Hogan has considered me as the writer of the paragraphs. I do write for the *Miscellany,* sometimes a great deal, sometimes a little. But Mr. Hogan is in error, if he imagines me to be the only writer for that print. Without avowing or disavowing the paragraphs which have excited his displeasure, I distinctly state that they express the sentiments which I entertain. Mr. Hogan has assailed me, and endeavoured to exhibit me as an enemy to the principles of free government. I trust I have shown by more than assertion, that I admire, and have always admired, governments founded upon the principles of freedom,—the principles of the American constitution. Mr. Hogan says, in page 4, that he "must confess he differs from me in political opinions, and that his are unchangable; neither time, nor place, nor circumstances, nor expectations can alter them." Mr. Hogan, who appears to have known my whole history in Ireland, and who here styled me "a patriot," must have known mine,—and, therefore, when he differs from them, he differs from the constitutional principles of American freedom with which mine are identified, and which I always cherished; and an attachment to which I publicly professed upon solemn oath, in the Court of the United States in this city. I did imagine, that a writer who professed to be so well acquainted "with the bright and progressive aspect which the human soul wears when it breaks through the fetters of slavery, and shakes off the incumbrances of ignorance, despotism, and superstition, as it has done in this country," would not be so irrevocably opposed to the principles of American politics, as "that neither time, nor place, nor circumstances, nor expectations could alter his determination." However, as I do not wish to take any advantage of Mr. Hogan's mistakes, I am ready to allow that he did not intend to come to this conclusion; but as his knowledge of logic must also be superior to mine, I feel astonished at his not having

been more exact in the statement and examination of his premises.

Mr. Hogan in the same place, makes another assertion with, I believe, more truth: "I must confess I differ with him in religious opinions." I am sincerely convinced of the truth of this. We do indeed differ in religious principles and opinions, and very widely. I am a Roman Catholic; Mr. Hogan, I am convinced, is not, and I make the assertion deliberately, and after reflection.

I have thus, Right Reverend Sir, made such observations as I thought were called for by my station, in reply to the personal attacks of the pamphleteer upon me individually. My motive for having done so I have already explained. To me the examination has been most painful and mortifying; and as I am not disposed to deprive even Mr. Hogan of the gratification which he may derive from knowing that he has even partially succeeded in the attainment of his object, I shall not strip him of the decoration of his triumph. However, I would advise the victor to make the most of what he has obtained, as he is never likely to have a recurrence. The evident object of the pamphlet was my mortification; of this I was previously informed by the writer himself, through the post-office: and never indeed was I more mortified and humbled, than in feeling myself called upon to answer and to compete with Mr. Hogan. It has been our first encounter: it shall also be the last. My crest has fallen, my vanity is punished, my arrogance is chastised, my petulance has been rebuked, my ambition has been checked, my pretensions to learning have been blasted, my hopes have withered, "the spear has fallen from my vindictive arm," "the envenomed sword of malice" has been wrested from my grasp—I am a fallen victim, "unacquainted with the science" of war, who know not how "to pursue the combat as a gentleman should," covered "with the odium and contempt which even my own imprudence has superinduced," and dreading "the rounds" which a triumphant antagonist can yet endure: "having lost my reputation in the city of Philadelphia," I shall retire satisfied with that portion which I have already received, "of scurrility and abuse, which only the vindictive and licentious indulge." It is true, that it has been given to me "in the mildest manner which the nature of the case would admit of, and with the highest deference to my feelings and station as a prelate," and by a priest who, on the day of his ordination, with the blessed sacrament still upon his tongue, on his knees before the altar, solemnly swore, according to the most ancient known rite of swearing allegiance, that he would "obey his bishop," whom you were, and reverence not only his own bishop, but the whole episcopal order. By his own

voluntary act, that obedience and reverence was by him, with your consent, transferred to me; and by the canons of the church, he stands solemnly sworn, in the presence of the whole church and of Heaven, to pay to me that obedience and reverence which he vowed on the day of his ordination. He has disobeyed me, where the canons gave me a right to command him. I charged him, as I do hereby again solemnly, and by virtue of his sworn obedience, charge him to desist from his sacrilegious attempt at ministry in Philadelphia, where he has no jurisdiction. He may boast of liberty, he may style me a despot— but will his boast of freedom, or his sneer at the episcopal authority, blot out the oath which he swore at the foot of the altar, and which is registered in heaven? "Do you promise obedience and reverence to your bishop?" "I do." (Form of ordination of a priest.) "I shall be guided by you as my bishop, in the future regulation of my conduct," (Letter of Reverend William Hogan to the Bishop of Charleston, October 18th, 1821.) "I now receive you into the diocess of Charleston," (Letter of the Bishop of Charleston, in answer to Mr. Hogan's, of the same date.) I promised on the 20th of October, to grant Mr. Hogan a release from this bond, provided he would apply for the release before a certain hour. He did not apply until several hours after the lapse of that specified time, nor until I had been under the necessity of doing the very act my anxiety to avoid doing which caused me to make the offer of release. After that act was done Mr. Hogan applied, but to this moment I have not given the release. Mr. Hogan's employers were, I believe, led to imagine I would countenance their schism, and to this I attribute their kindness to me, and the praises which they bestowed upon me; but perceiving their error, I became the object of their vituperation. To Mr. Hogan himself, when I perceived a disposition to return to the path of duty, I thought kindness was due; but, when I discovered that he had determined to continue in schism, I frequently reflected on the words of the Psalmist: "Why dost thou declare my justices, and take my convenant in thy mouth? Seeing thou hast hated discipline, and hast cast my words behind thee: if thou didst see a thief, thou didst run with him: and with adulterers thou hast been a partaker. Thy mouth hath abounded with evil, and thy tongue hath formed deceits. Sitting, thou didst speak ill against thy brother, and dist lay a scandal against thy mother's son; these things thou hast done, and I was silent. Thou thoughtest unjustly, that I shall be like to thee; but I will reprove thee, and set before thy face." (*Psalm* xlix. 16 and so forth.) Filled with the reflections which this passage was calculated to

excite, I have indeed had melancholy moments, not from any regret for my own acts, but through grief at seeing evils which I could not heal. Mr. Hogan's arguments were easily overturned: the ground upon which he stood was evidently bad; but of what avail was this? His employers did not seek for truth, but for triumph; to argue with them would be folly. To quote canon law for men who did not know one of its principles, who should be first taught even its technical phraseology before they could comprehend its earliest distinctions—to defeat by a single assault a man who kept no fixed position, who was perpetually shifting his ground—to acknowledge the laity of St. Mary's the competent tribunal before whom a bishop should plead his cause, and demand authority to do his duty, was what I neither then nor now could do. Therefore I have not, nor will I meet Mr. Hogan in his attempts at canon law: I confess my incompetency to the task. Without boasting of my own proficiency in the study, I have no hestitation in staking whatever relic of character may yet remain to me upon the truth of the assertion, that Mr. Hogan does not know how to discover whether a canon be abrogated or in force. With him, then, it would be impossible for me to argue. But there is another obstacle in the way. Though I am not Mr. Binney or Mr. Sergeant—and Mr. Hogan may be, any young gentleman of what talent he pleases, even one of my correspondents, if he will—a clever young lawyer of Philadelphia: still, however unqualified I may be, I am an ecclesiastical judge in the highest tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church, by the constitution of that church, which, if Mr. Hogan were a Roman Catholic, he would acknowledge to have been established by our divine Redeemer himself; and it will be generally admitted, that, although it is not indecorous for a judge to expostulate with and to advise a person during trial, it is not unusual for him to enter in an argument upon the nature of his commission, or the extent of his authority with the culprit, upon whom he has passed sentence.

I am now done with the explanations of my own individual conduct in this unfortunate transaction. Mr. Hogan and his associates may write and speak of me as they please—for the future they may cut me into stars, or mould me into moons, as they may think proper. Upon that topic I am done. They shall be left in undisturbed possession of the arena. But, Right Reverend Sir, I shall take the liberty of troubling you and the public with a few other observations on the contents of the pamphlet. I am, Right Reverend Sir,

Your obedient, humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER X

CHARLESTON, Nov. 7, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—In my last I have taken my leave of the Reverend Wm. Hogan and his associates, so far as I am personally concerned. He and they may henceforward speak and write of me without expecting a reply to any statement they may please to make.

But, I cannot dismiss the pamphlet without a few additional observations, not indeed upon the semblance of canon law which it contains, for upon that topic, too, I shall leave the gentleman unanswered. My object, then, is to give expression to a faint hope which I still cherish, that Mr. Hogan was not the writer of the pamphlet, and to state my grounds for that hope; or if I be deceived in this, to lament that I see no prospect of Mr. Hogan's return to the path of duty.

The Reverend Wm. Hogan may feel displeased at your withdrawing his faculties, and your subsequently inflicting canonical punishment for his irregular usurpation of the ministry. He may feel displeased with me for having inflicted canonical censures upon him also when, being under my jurisdiction, he deliberately disobeyed me. Did he confine his vituperation to us both, there might be some ground for supposing that we were perhaps hasty or inconsiderate, or ignorant. He could not, perhaps, be censured if, finding his appeal rejected or not received, he should be displeased with the archbishop. Neither should he be suspected of wanting Catholic faith if, finding no redress here, he had drawn up a formal complaint against the archbishop, and you and me, and sent it to the Holy See; there would have been an appearance of regularity in all this, and something like an observance of those canons with which he is so much enamoured. Was this his conduct? No. But he erects himself into a tribunal, quotes, for his authority, canons which have not the most remote connexion with his case, and most of which had been actually repealed, and then pronounces himself guiltless, condemns those who sentenced him as having incurred censures, and denounces them as irregular; and thus, from having been a person under censures, he becomes the judge of his judges without any commission, and sentences those who sentenced him, without even lodging a complaint before the tribunal which had been established to hear and to determine the appeal in such cases. Was this correct? Yet, such has been his conduct. So that, even supposing the archbishop negligent, and you and me culpable, still he is irregular. It may, perhaps, be useful to ask how

did this happen? How much would the appeal have cost him? I shall state here one fact, that when I spoke of sending the charges to Rome, and if necessary sending an agent, "in going to the wharf I stated to Mr. Ashley," that it would be, I thought, well to send an agent, if they could substantiate their charges; and Mr. Ashley remarked, that sending to Rome was expensive, and they could not afford it. I feel convinced, Mr. Ashley must recollect what I have said, and what he had said, better than he could what I am to suppose was, by mistake, inserted as having been stated by me to him in page 13, but which was never said by me, nor thought of by me.

There can be no doubt, but sending an agent anywhere will generally cost the support and pay of that agent. But Mr. Hogan could, and now can, lodge and prosecute his appeal without any expense, save the postage of his letters and documents to Rome, and the postage of the answers from Rome. And if their love of justice and reformation will not urge those gentlemen to defray those charges, I do hereby publicly bind myself to defray all the expenses of the suit, be the result what it may, if they will enter and prosecute the appeal against you and me, or against either of us, provided their first notice shall be transmitted before the first day of next January.

If, then, we have acted uncanonically and arbitrarily, let our ignorance and despotism be exposed and punished, not by Mr. Hogan, but by a competent tribunal. If Mr. Hogan and his employers be Roman Catholics, they will act upon this principle. If they be not Roman Catholics, why deceive the public by assuming an appellation to which they are not entitled.

The impression on my mind is, that the leaders of the schism are as fully convinced of the irregularity of their proceedings as you are, or as I am, and they will not have recourse to any regular ecclesiastical tribunal, lest "it would leave an opening to the bishop to enter again and to officiate in St. Mary's Church." (p. 16.) Thus it is not justice but victory they seek; and whilst they persuade the dupes of their artifices that they are Roman Catholics, they avoid seeking a decision upon the principles of the Roman Catholic Church, knowing that you would, by that decision, be reinstated, which result they wish to avoid. If this be not schism, there never was schism in the church—and yet these men talk of canon law.

But, suppose the archbishop and you and I were in error. The writer of the pamphlet says, that "the good of religion in this country, requires a just and final decision should be made as speedily as possible." Our statement is, that the decision has been already made

by the competent tribunal, and that it is just. They affect to deny the competency of the tribunal, and proclaim the decision to be unjust and irregular. It is, then, in plain common sense, and plain common law, their duty, as it is their right, to apply to the superior tribunal for that final and just decision. They can do so without expense. We call upon them to do so. They affect to acknowledge the superiority and the competence of the tribunal which we point out; and if they be Roman Catholics, they are bound to the acknowledgment. Why not then prosecute their cause, especially when they can do so without expense? Because they know the decision would confirm the condemnation of Mr. Hogan and his adherents. But why do we not apply for the decision? Because we do not need to disturb that which has been made. We know already the justice of the decision which has been made, and we do not seek to disturb it. Was it ever known that a judge appealed from his own tribunal against his own sentence? Was it ever known that a body of persons in whose favour the judge pronounced a decision, appealed from that decision to a higher tribunal? If Mr. Hogan and his adherents say the sentence is unjust, they ought to be the appellants. But they do not want to appeal, for they have all they require—they have the church and they want no more. But they hold that church by physical force against the law of the Catholic Church. Thus, though they possess the property, they are disobedient to the law. They are schismatics.

The compiler of the pamphlet appears to care but little for the laws or the tribunals of the Roman Catholic Church. In the form of consecrating bishops according to the pontifical, the very first duty of a bishop is stated to be a judge, the second, an interpreter of the Holy Scriptures and of church law. In the same book, in the form of ordaining a priest, his duties are stated to be, 1 to offer sacrifice, 2 to bless, 3 to preside over, 4 to preach, and 5 to baptize, and in doing this he is to be in aid to the Catholic bishops who were prefigured by Moses and the twelve Apostles; and towards the close of the admonition, the person about to be ordained is addressed as one chosen to be consecrated to the aid of the person who ordains, who, of course, is a bishp. Thus, if law and custom were even silent upon the subject, the very forms testify the relative situations of the several parties. Still, the pamphleteer will not abide by the judgment or the interpretation of the bishop, and Mr. Hogan is to be the opponent and not the aid of the bishops, and the laity of St. Mary's Church are not to be governed by the established tribunals of the Roman Catholic Church, but are to sit in judgment upon its judges.

Page 30. "How have you made it appear, Right Reverend and aged Editor, that St. Mary's congregation is opposed to church discipline? If opposition to the unreasonable mandates of a bishop, if resisting the doctrine that he is to be obeyed 'right or wrong,' is a proof of their hostility to church discipline, I have no hesitation in believing them to be its avowed enemies, and determined to overthrow it. If blind obedience to episcopal mandates, whether just or unjust, be the only tenure by which they retain a claim to Catholicity, I verily believe they have surrendered it, and are satisfied to remain as they are, neither sacrificing their feelings to episcopal vanity, nor compromising their faith to support his despotic views, resting their belief on the Gospel of our Lord Jesus, as interpreted by the holy Roman Catholic Church, and not on the opinion of any frail prelate or any roving monk."

Now let us, for a moment, examine the principle of this paragraph. Suppose a person sentenced by a district judge of the United States, his case re-examined by another, and the sentence renewed: this person says all their acts are against law and justice, and states that he is convinced the superior court would reverse their decisions, yet does not appeal to that court, but proclaims that he is an injured man, and that "if opposition to the unreasonable mandate of a judge, if resisting the doctrine that he is to be obeyed 'right or wrong,' be a proof of his hostility to the constitution, he has no hesitation in believing his friends to be its avowed enemies, and determined to overthrow it." "If blind obedience to judicial mandates, whether just or unjust, be the only tenure by which they can retain a claim to the constitution, he verily believes they have surrendered it, and are satisfied to remain as they are, neither sacrificing their feelings to judicial vanity, nor compromising their principles to support his despotic views, resting their politics upon the laws of the country as interpreted by the nation and not on the opinion of any frail judge or roving lawyer." Does this declaration contain the principles of the jurisprudence of any nation or society that ever had respectable existence?

It requires but a moment's examination to discover the several false insinuations clumsily wrought into this tirade. 1st. There is a gratuitous assumption that these were unreasonable mandates. 2d. That our doctrine was, that bishops were to be obeyed "right or wrong." 3d. That blind obedience to episcopal mandates, whether just or unjust, is the only tenure by which a claim to Catholicity can be retained. 4th. That the congregation of St. Mary's was required to sacrifice its feelings to episcopal vanity. 5th. That they were required to compromise their faith to support the despotic views of some undefined bishop. And 6th. That they were required to abandon the interpretations of the holy Roman Catholic Church, and to yield to the opinion of a frail prelate or a roving monk. The whole sentence

is then a blending of unfounded insinuation, untrue assertion, and principles opposed to those of the Roman Catholic Church.

But it is not only the archbishop, and you and I that are to be quenched from the starry firmament by the superior information of the self-taught canonist, but every other bishop in America. We are henceforward to be amenable to the tribunal of the laity.

Page 32. "If, sir, you imagine that the people of this country will surrender the right which they have purchased with their blood, of judging of the conduct and actions of those who are placed in public stations, and supported by their property, you are entirely out of your calculation. This is a privilege appertaining to all Americans, and a privilege which, I trust, they will never yield to a diadem or mitre."

I never imagined that the people of America were to surrender a right of which the veriest slave in the universe cannot be divested, of which he could not if he would divest himself—the right which is inseparable from the faculty of judging of the conduct and actions, not only of those who are placed in public stations, and supported by their property, but of the conduct and actions of every individual whose conduct may come under his observation. The wretched slave who, bound under the hands of the executioner, trembles on the verge of the grave, has the right of judging of the conduct and actions of the legislator who has prescribed his fate, of the judge who has passed his sentence, of the officer who superintends its execution; and neither he nor the free American has purchased this right by his blood—he has received it from the God who bestowed upon him the faculty of which he cannot be divested. The writer need not apprehend that a diadem or mitre can deprive the American of what the American could not bestow, nor the diadem or mitre could receive.

But if the pamphleteer means that every public officer in America must be guided in his actions and in his conduct by the decisions of those who are capable of passing that judgment, he asserts an absurdity for he requires an impossibility. Because those judges do not agree, and no public officer can at the same moment obey those who tell him to do a particular act, and those who forbid his doing that act, he asserts what is contrary to the constitution, for the constitution tells the officer to obey the law, and not the dictate of any portion of the people: and for the explanation of that law, the constitution refers him to the judges and not to the people; but for the creation and formation and reformation of that law, it refers to the people through their representatives, and not to the people at large; and in this last point only does the Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church differ from that of the United States. The pamphleteer has

been pleased to quote the saying of the Saviour who made the Constitution of the Roman Catholic Church, "*regnum meum non est de hoc mundo*—my kingdom is not of this world." Had the pamphleteer kept this principle in view, it would have saved him many mistakes, and saved me much trouble. The authority in the Roman Catholic Church is derived not from the people who never framed its constitution, who never revealed its doctrines who never instituted its sacraments, who never consecrated its bishops, who never ordained its priests, who never voted upon its decisions of faith, who never had any power to regulate its discipline; in a word, religion is not like civil government, a human invention—it is not the creature of man; it is an emanation from heaven, regulated by the institutions of Jesus Christ, and those to whom he and not the people gave authority, and not modelled upon the forms of earthly governments, nor specially fitted for monarchies or republics, but equally independent of each and incontrollable by either. Thus it does not follow, that because in republics the people, who are the source of civil power, do exercise an influence in legislation, the same people who are not the source of ecclesiastical power, should exercise an influence in ecclesiastical legislation; and although the people by their share in making the laws, have an indirect influence over the civil officers, yet those officers look to the judges, and not to the people for the explanation of those laws. Still the pamphleteer would argue, that where the people have no legislative right in ecclesiastical concerns, where they have by the constitution no controlling power, they and not the constitutional judges ought to be the interpreters of the law. Admirable logician!

The paragraph which I now quote, could not have been intended to mean what it conveys; or if it was, of course the whole question of the pamphleteer's religion is at an end. The assertion contained in it would certainly be a sufficient ground upon which to rest the last quoted, and several other passages of the pamphlet, viz.: "That laymen are not considered inferior to bishops in the hierarchy." The passage is this, page 33: "Profit by the heavenly saying; learn that laymen are not your inferiors in society, nor perhaps in the order of Christianity, although not considered so in the hierarchy." My impression is, that the last not has crept in by some mistake, for surely the pamphleteer could not have meant to consider laymen and bishops to be upon an equality in the hierarchy. I shall freely concede, that in society I know many laymen far my superiors; but other bishops must think for themselves. In the practice of religion, which is what

I suppose is meant by "the order of Christianity," I know there have been, and there are very many holy priests and laymen, and there have been unfortunately some unholy bishops, and some unholy priests, and some unholy laymen. In claiming a preeedenee of eeclesiastical authority, by virtue of the divine eommission, the Roman Catholic bishops do not claim a preeedenee in society, nor in virtue; and they agree with the pamphleteer, "that talents and elevated stations, unless supported by virtue and a striet regard for the rights of others, so far from eonferring honour on him who possesses them, only render him an objeet of eontempt;" but they also know and feel that it is equally ineumbent upon them to preserve their own rights; and one of those right of which they have no power to divest themselves, is that of being the sole judges in eeclesiastieal eauses and the sole legislators of the ehureh. This power and authority they believe to have been transmitted to them by Christ through the Apostles; and though the pamphleteer may ridieule their pretensions, he eannot destroy their eonvietions; and if he have not this eonviction also, he is not a Roman Catholie.

Mark, however, the language whieh he uses, page 32:

"Would it be presuming too much, nowadays, when the number of disciples and apostolical successors can be equalled only by the number of their follies and excesses, to judge of you and some of your brethren by the same divine test, 'by their fruits you shall know them?' And if on investigation the fruits should be found of a destructive quality, would it not be good economy, at least, in the people from whom you receive your support, to cut down the tree, or what would amount to the same, cease to cultivate it, and allow it to perish, or withdraw from you that support which they give you, and without which you must perish or seek for subsistence in some more congenial soil."

"This mode of procedure may not suit your views; it is not perhaps calculated to forward your domineering projects in this country; such language must be extremely unpalatable to you, but the sooner you are told the truth the better: benefit by it, limit your ideas, confine your views, reduce within a narrower compass your visionary projects."

In page 30, the Catholie who obeys a bishop is compared to the Tartar, and the Pope and bishops to the Grand Lama; and it is asserted, that I and every other pompous or weak prelate, looks upon himself as "the visible representative of the mighty Jehovah," who requires "the unhappy Roman Catholics of this eountry, under pain of damnation, to consider him as such," and "to bow with awe and Tartar subservieney to his decisions, just or unjust, reasonable or otherwise."

Can it be, that a person claiming to be a Roman Catholie, and still daring to offieiate as a priest, penned those passages? How many

false insinuations do they contain? How becoming in a man who upon his knees just after having received the holy sacrament of the Eucharist on the day of his ordination solemnly swore that he would pay obedience and reverence to his bishop? This obedience is manifested by a direct and acknowledged opposition to their authority, and not to that of one, or two, or three, but of disobedience to every bishop under whom he lived, and in opposition to the decision of every bishop in America; and this reverence is exhibited by his compreparing them to the Grand Lama, by his stating, in page 31, that by my "overacting a farce, I and my Right Reverend brethren will become the laughing stock of our audience." I do not profess to be as well acquainted with the theatre as is the pamphleteer; but if the Reverend William Hogan be of opinion, that the discharge of the most solemn and awful duties of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy is acting a farce, can he be considered a Roman Catholic? I may be pompous, I may be weak; but young as I am, in the eye of religion I am Mr. Hogan's father. He would have had compassion on my weakness, and cloaked my faults, were he animated by the spirit of filial obedience and reverence. Did I lie exposed in my tent, he should not have laughed at me, and exhibited me to his brethren; his piety, did he possess any, would have taught him to remember his oath; and though I shall not imitate the example of the patriarch in the treatment of his younger son, still the irreverence is not less.

Mr. Hogan knows, that neither the Pope nor the bishops of the Catholic Church lay claim to impeccability. Why then compare them to the Grand Lama, who he says is considered impeccable? I should hope that Mr. Hogan was not the writer. He knows that neither the Pope nor any individual bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, lays claim to infallibility. Why then compare them to the Grand Lama, who is considered by the Tartar to be infallible? He knows that Mr. Hogan was not required by any bishop "to obey him right or wrong, whether his decisions were just or unjust, reasonable or otherwise;" but he was required to obey the bishop when he was right, when his decision was just and reasonable. But neither Mr. Hogan nor the congregation of St. Mary's, were to be allowed to decide upon the rectitude, the justice, or the reasonableness of the bishop's order or decision, because in the Roman Catholic Church there is a tribunal regularly established for revising those decisions; and the bishop's order and decision is, by the constant usage and law of the church, considered right, just, and reasonable, until canceled by that tribunal upon proper application of the party considering it wrong, un-

just, or unreasonable; and until Mr. Hogan procured that reversion, the order which he received, and the decisions which were given are considered right, just, and reasonable. Why then was the writer guilty of insinuating, that "the unhappy Roman Catholics of this country were in a state of Tartar subjection?" Such has always been the charge made by those who separated from the Roman Catholic Church upon its adherents. With the pamphleteer it has not the merit of novelty. It has been the language of every one who opposed the church, from Nicholas the deacon to Joanna Southcott. The fact which it assumes, is a gross misrepresentation; and the principle upon which it is founded, has been condemned as a heresy.

I have, from a sense of duty, been compelled to wade through many volumes of the reproaches and abusive language of the assailants of the church in every age; but never have I, in the most envenomed acrimony of its worst enemy, found anything to exceed the irreverent vituperation of Mr. Hogan, who still professes to be guided by the holy Gospel, as interpreted by the church, and still exhibits the persons solemnly recognised by that church, as the authorized interpreters of that Gospel, as "frail prelates," "pompous prelates," "weak prelates," "actors of a farce," "laughing stock of their audience," "a Grand Lama," "men whose number can be equalled only by their follies and excesses," "objects of contempt," "entitled only to the most sovereign indifference of the Reverend William Hogan," "Right Reverend Doctors of the law, having the devil for an imaginary monarch," "ready to inflict the vengeance of the whole mitred body upon any individual who wishes to oppose tyranny in any shape, or who expresses his displeasure or disapprobation of episcopal usurpations and local abuses," "numerous as the locusts of the summer, and proverbially relentless and unforgiving," "vain, pompous, and vindictive prelates," and so forth. Does the pamphleteer imagine, that any man who is capable of reflection, will believe the person who styles the authorized interpreters of the Gospel thus, could seriously avow that he rests his belief on the Gospel as interpreted by them? Yet this is the only authority recognised in the Roman Catholic Church for its interpretation. The trick is now old. Though still it produces some effect, no innovator or opposer of the church ever commenced by saying, that the holy Roman Catholic Church was not the source of authority. Martin Luther, who was a man of an hundred times Mr. Hogan's talent, was the most obedient child of the Roman Catholic Church, if he was to be credited; he only was anxious for the purity of faith and the perfection of discipline; he only wished to assert the

rights of the people in opposition to weak, pompous, and vindictive prelates, and roving monks. Did he mean to oppose the church? No, God forbid. The church was the pillar and ground of truth; Christ commanded obedience to her, and he would pay it. But it was not the church he disobeyed; it was only "a weak, pompous prelate who looked upon himself as the visible representative of the mighty Jehovah, and required the unhappy Roman Catholics of his day to bow with awe and Tartar subserviency to his decisions, just or unjust, reasonable or otherwise," that he opposed or resisted. When the Pope should speak he would obey. The Pope did speak, and in the courtly language of this gentlemanly reformer, "he was an ass," "a little ass;" but he would listen to a general council, because that indeed was a proper authority, and when a council did take place; it was not a proper council of bishops, such as would have been held in the good old times, but "the synagogue of Satan," the Reverend Wm. Hogan's "imaginary monarch." And Mr. Hogan is a man who swore to obey and reverence his bishop!

Anxious as I am, Right Reverend Sir, to close this disagreeable exposition, still I feel myself called upon by its nature and circumstances which have entangled me in its meshes, to continue the examination of the pamphlet.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient, humble servant and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XII

CHARLESTON, Nov. 22, 1822.

To the Right Reverend Doctor Conwell, Bishop of Philadelphia.

Right Reverend Sir:—In this letter I shall make a few remarks upon some of the other topics of the pamphlet, for the purpose of exhibiting the doctrine of the writer.

In the appendix, page 35, is found the following passage, after giving the form of excommunication, as published in the *Miscellany*:—

"We have never denied the above excommunication being genuine; and, if I mistake not, the papers to which he alludes never denied its authentiticy. They have given to the public (as they could give no other) only the form of excommunication said to be pronounced by Doctor Conwell; nor has the editor of the Charleston *Miscellany* attempted to prove that they did not give it correctly."

There are here two statements, both put together with a wretched attempt of what was, I suppose, considered ingenuity. It is not true that the editor of the *Miscellany* charged those persons whom he ex-

posed with denying the authenticity of a form which had not been before the public. But it is true that he did charge them with putting forth Sterne's vile fabrication of revolting blasphemy as a genuine document; and he has proved that they did not give the form which you did use correctly, for the form which you did use has been published in the *Miscellany*, and both in technical and critical composition it was not merely accurate, but creditable to its compiler. Mr. Hogan's employers, or those who aided them, could have given another form than what they did, viz., the true form instead of the forgery; and thus the second part of the paragraph is untrue. As to the flimsy mean quibble of playing upon words to endeavour to preserve actual truth, and to convey to the reader actual falsehood, by printing the passage, "the form of excommunication said to be," and so forth, it is only useful to prove the *dolus animi* of the compiler.

Never was there a more base, unprincipled, and irreligious, nor a more flagrant and unblushing attempt at deceit than in giving the blasphemy of Sterne to the people of America as a genuine document of the Roman Catholic Church, and that by men calling themselves Catholics, to a people whose former connexion with England rendered them easily deceived by any misrepresentation of our religion. I have never known so criminal a public forgery. And can it be possible that Mr. Hogan will avow himself a participator in this crime, and still complain of being treated harshly?

In the next page is the following sentence:

"Whether the excommunication pronounced by Doctor Conwell be the above, that taken from *Tristram Shandy*, or the 109th *Psalm*, which is used in the cases of necessity, it was destitute of canonical form," and so forth.

This affectation of ignorance of the form, this pretence that he was in doubt, but that the form used by you was taken from *Tristram Shandy*, and this upon a solemn occasion, one of the most solemn and awful to a man possessing any sentiment befitting a Roman Catholic, not to say a priest—is it credible that a Roman Catholic could think thus—could write thus? As to the 109th *Psalm*, and Mr. Hogan's cases of necessity, if Mr. Hogan be the compiler of this pamphlet, why take the Protestant numeration of the Scriptures, if he be a Roman Catholic? Has he gone so far as to charge the church with corrupting the holy Scriptures? And if he have not, why abandon the Roman Catholic for the Protestant numeration, and division, and translation of the Psalms? But what has this to do with excommunication? The Catholic Church has not prescribed in his case, nor in any similar cases, such a form; the attempt at witticism is lost, but

the evidence of levity and want of Catholic faith, and want of respect for ecclesiastical ordinances is apparent.

In the same page he complains that "you gave no previous admonition" before issuing the excommunication. In the Number 12 of the *Miscellany,* page 95, I find inserted your notice and admonition, dated February 11th; and in November 13, page 102, is the form of excommunication, which was pronounced on the 27th of May, after a lapse of 106 days, and yet he states there were no admonitions!! But the truth is, he cared as little for the form as he did for the substance; and the manner in which the pamphleteer expresses himself, shows how little he values either, though he has endeavoured to shelter himself under alleged irregularities of form.

The value which the pamphleteer sets upon excommunication may be estimated from his own expressions, page 4:

"It is true I may venture to oppose this gentleman, (who can consign to hell whole communities,) with less fear than others; for my body having been already disposed of by himself and his brother Henry, for the good of my soul, and feeling no inconvenience from it, on the contrary much more comfort than ever, I have nothing to apprehend from an opposition to him."

Excommunication has always been considered by Roman Catholics as one of the heaviest misfortunes which could befall a man. This man feels much more comfortable than ever under an excommunication, not from one, but from two bishops. Has he the sentiments of a Roman Catholic?

Roman Catholics venerate the Apostles, and do not profanely jest with the expressions of the holy Scriptures. This man jests profanely and irreverently with the inspired writings of the Apostle St. Paul (I *Cor.* v. 5), where on a most solemn occasion he found himself obliged to excommunicate an unfortunate young man, by giving him up to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit might be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. Can the man who thus profanely jests with this important passage of the inspired writer be a Christian? Thus it is that he talks of the power of assigning to hell whole communities. He continues:

"This business of giving bodies to the devil for the good of the soul is a bad traffic in this country."

Does this man believe the Bible to be the word of the eternal God? Does he believe St. Paul to have been the apostle of our blessed Redeemer? "And like every other trade, it is getting worse in all countries." Thus, the apostleship is a trade; and still simpletons are found to regard as a faithful priest the writer who thus openly avows himself ridiculing the doctrines of St. Paul, and the customs and in-

stitutions derived from the Saviour as trades!!! Do they think this man believes in any revealed doctrine? I unhesitatingly assert that, if his words have any meaning, he is the most decided infidel who ever committed his thoughts to paper.

"The right reverend doctors of the law must have recourse to some other means of keeping their cathedrals. If they would endeavour to reverse the proposition, and persuade the people that it is the soul that is given to this imaginary monarch of theirs, I think it would answer their purposes better."

Then the writer looks upon the devil to be only an imaginary being, of whose power to take souls the right reverend doctors, whose monarch this imaginary being is, ought to endeavour to persuade the people. And this man says he is a Roman Catholic!!! Indeed, I should feel in no wise astonished, did he to-morrow publish that the all-wise Creator of the universe was an imaginary being, and still say he was a Roman Catholic for the purpose of keeping St. Mary's Church; and if the charter were changed, and the property given to Mahometans, I should expect to see him as willingly and as readily officiate in the mosque as he now usurps the ministry of a Roman Catholic priest.

I have done—my expectations of doing some good led me, at Mr. Hogan's request, and I hoped not without your concurrence, to interfere in the concerns of your diocess. I am still under the impression that in what I have done I did not exceed your commission; if I did, I regret it: it was on my part unintentional; I request your indulgence for my oversight. We have been misrepresented to each other. Under a pressure of extraordinary circumstances I have been led to speak without sufficient deliberation and caution, though I trust I have demonstrated that I have not used the vile language which the pamphleteer has attributed to me; still I was less careful than I ought in my expressions, and I regret it. In your letters to me since I thus publicly addressed you, your expressions have been more than kind, and I feel it therefore unnecessary to enter upon any recapitulation, to prove what you are already convinced of, that my sole object in the interference was to endeavour to procure peace for a distracted city—to aid in restoring union where irreligion had created schism—to try and convince men who professed to be Roman Catholics, that they were violating every Catholic principle—and the chief encouragement that I felt, was the hope that, as I had theretofore refrained from expressing a decided opinion, my arguments might have the more weight. But I left Philadelphia with the conviction, which every day has become stronger, that the schismatics cannot at present be pacified, but by your betraying your duty, by your sacrificing the in-

terests of religion. They may perhaps succeed in depriving the Catholics of their church: a building, when compared with faith, is a trifle. Our predecessors in Ireland were despoiled of edifices and of income, because they would not betray their consciences and change their religion. I suspect in many instances similar sacrifices must be made in this country before long. The evil here is greater, as it is more disguised. But the principle of church government is equally a portion of our religion, as is the doctrine of the incarnation; and the one has been taught by our Lord equally as the other: it is therefore equally necessary to have it preserved.

In consequence of my having been publicly assailed by the pamphleteer for my conduct in Ireland and in Philadelphia, I felt that I owed it to my station to give to the public, as well as to you, the explanations which I did. I do not despise public opinion, but I shall do nothing, I trust, for the purpose of courting the praise of the people. I have entered perhaps too fully into detail, and perhaps not always sufficiently restrained that involuntary feeling to which all men are subject, a desire to inform the public who that person is that has publicly assailed them. I set out with the determination of noticing the conduct of my assailant only as regards the church of Philadelphia and myself. If I have gone farther, it was from the impulse of the moment, in violation of my resolution. Be the number of my days many or few, be my sojorn in this country long or short, I have for ever closed upon those personal topics which I have been compelled to notice; but they have been forced upon me. I cherish the hope that, be my imperfections and faults what they may, the public will believe that the government of the Roman Catholic Church is not so weak or so corrupt as to permit one of its most important situations in this country to be occupied by such a criminal as was described by the pamphleteer.

I remain, Right Reverend Sir, your obedient, humble servant, and brother in Christ,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

LETTER XIII

CHARLESTON, Jan. 6, 1825.

To the Roman Catholics of the Diocess of Philadelphia.

My Brethren:—I have received a letter from your bishop, in which are the following passages:

"Great scandal has been taken in my diocess from the encourage-

ment you are thought to afford the excommunicated and usurping priest, O'Meally."

After describing Mr. O'Meally's address to some persons in St. Mary's Church:

"He then assured his hearers that they might put their confidence in you, and that you were the only bishop from whom they could expect countenance and support, and closed by lamenting that some favourable wind had not blown you more northwardly."

Again:

"The schismatics are animated by the persuasion that the letter or letters to which I allude are genuine, whilst the Catholics are deeply scandalized, not only at their import, but at your correspondence at all with a notoriously excommunicated priest, who is daily profaning the body and blood of the Lord, and glorying in the deed."

The above passages have greatly afflicted me, as they convey, from the best authority, an assurance that what I believe to have been only the correct discharge of my duty has been greatly misunderstood. And though I am convinced that I have done only what I ought to do under the circumstances, yet I also feel convinced that it is my duty, not through any human motive, I trust, but upon a principle of natural and divine law, to give you such explanation as may take away any just cause of scandal from my conduct.

To enter into detail upon the subject would be tedious, useless, and unpleasant. In Doctor Conwell's diocess I have no jurisdiction, nor any claim thereto. In its administration I have no concern; upon his administration I have never, that I recollect, given an opinion; upon his conduct towards Mr. Hogan I have never, since I have been in Philadelphia, which was in 1821, had to hesitate as to what judgment I would pronounce. It was canonical and correct. Upon Mr. O'Meally's claim to be pastor of St. Mary's, upon his right to do any clerical duty in Doctor Conwell's diocess, I never entertained a doubt. His claim is unfounded; he has no right. As to the validity of his acts, for whose value jurisdiction would be required, no person can raise a question; they are all invalid. As to the validity and legality of the bishop's censures of that gentleman, there can be no question; they are legal and valid. As to the right of presentation being in the trustees of St. Mary's Church: there is not even the semblance of a canonical ground upon which it could rest. As to the manner in which the opposition to Doctor Conwell has been conducted: it has been worse than injudicious and unwarrantable. Of course it is now unnecessary for me to add, that with all or any of

the acts or principles here described or alluded to, I had not, I have not, and will not have any connexion. It is also unnecessary for me to add, that it would be very extraordinary if I have written anything inconsistent with those declarations. I have now lying before me, after my perusal, copies of my letters upon these subjects. The bishop, Mr. O'Meally, every person to whom I have written a syllable regarding the disturbances and disunion of your church, have my full leave to publish, or use in any other way, the entire, or any fair extract. And if there be found a single passage inconsistent with the above declarations, I shall retract it and express my regret, and thus remove scandal if I have given it.

But why correspond at all with a notoriously excommunicated priest? My friends, the church permits it in several cases; this I looked upon to be one of those which was most plainly designated. A charitable interference for his good, and perhaps for the good of others: I wrote under circumstances which not only permitted, but which compelled me, as I thought then, and still believe, to write. Mr. O'Meally wrote to me a respectful letter, stating his case, and asking my advice and opinion. I knew he had done wrong. I knew he had been excommunicated. But many worse men than I look upon Mr. O'Meally to be, have, after doing wrong, done right. Was I to refuse advice to those who applied to me because they were guilty? I knew that the duties of my place were not domination and harshness, but to give counsel, and to procure reconciliation, and when I should find my efforts fail, then steadily to resist those who continued obstinately wrong; being, however, always ready to lay aside resistance when they would relax from their obstinacy. Never to sacrifice principle; but to be ready to sacrifice myself. These are the lessons which I was taught; those are the principles of administration which the church entrusted to my keeping, and to preserve which I bound myself by the most solemn pledges. I thought, although Mr. O'Meally was not in my diocess, still that he had a claim upon me, if not for justice, at least for charitable counsel. My letter might do good, it could do no harm; I therefore thought myself not only at liberty to answer, but under an obligation of answering his application. In precise, decisive unequivocal terms, I informed him that his conduct was incorrect, and I advised him to desist from a ministry which he had no right to exercise. He answered my letter; and upon one occasion, during a correspondence which ensued, he requested my interference upon such grounds as I thought would lay the basis of a reconciliation between the bishop and the trustees, though I distinctly informed Mr.

O'Meally that in the event of a reconciliation, his claims could not be considered; he pressed me to make the effort, pledging himself that his individual interest should be no obstacle. I wrote to Doctor Conwell for the purpose of having his consent to mediate, stating my hope that a ground was laid for making an experiment. His answer was substantially, that my former interference had been mischievous, and that any repetition of intermeddling in the affairs of his diocess, was contrary to his wish. To the pressing entreaties of Mr. O'Meally, subsequently repeated, my uniform answer was, that the Bishop of Philadelphia would not allow my mediation. After Mr. O'Meally published an address upon the subject, he wrote to me for the purpose of learning, whether I would, on behalf of the laity, if requested by them, represent them to the Holy See. I felt it to be prudent on my part to decline the contemplated appointment, and to accompany the expression of my disinclination with such reasons and statements as, whilst they distinctly marked my condemnation of what was wrong, exhibited an opinion and a hope which I still entertain, that if Mr. O'Meally did withdraw from the church of St. Mary's, the difference between Doctor Conwell and the trustees could be so adjusted, that principle could be saved on one side, and feelings on the other, whilst the interests of religion would be upheld and peace and union restored to your afflicted church. I deeply lament the disappointment of this hope, though I still entertain the opinion. However, this I am free to avow, not only is it possible, but it is probable I am in error. Your bishop knows all the facts of the case; I do not: with his administration I have no concern, with my own conduct as regards scandalising you I have much. To afford you this explanation became a duty. You will confer a favour by allowing it to remove from your minds any erroneous opinion that I considered the trustees to be right and the bishop to be wrong. As regards the ministry of Mr. O'Meally, my declaration is distinct. As regards the opposition to the bishop, upon that ground, and respecting the right of patronage, it is equally so. If the trustees complain of other grievances, if they feel other inconvenience, with this I have no concern. I can neither examine as to their existence, nor could I afford a remedy if they do exist. I have, therefore, avoided inquiring as to the truth or falsehood of several allegations which were made to me in their respect.

I trust I have now discharged my obligations to your bishop and to you; I still owe to my episcopal brethren and to the Holy See, if they shall require it, a more full explanation. To them I am ready to answer; and should they take up my scandals for examination, to their judg-

ment I shall bow. And I trust that should their sentence reach to my right eye, or to my right hand, I shall recollect the injunction of our blessed Lord. I might have erred, but I shall not be obstinate. I am not the superior of my brother of Philadelphia, neither is he my judge. To the Synod of the United States, consisting of the Archbishop of Baltimore and his suffragans, or to the Holy See, or to both, I am ready and willing to account. To any individual bishop I shall cheerfully give any farther explanation for which he may seek. But the Bishop of Philadelphia must be aware that I owe no more to him than what he has already received.

My brethren, these are extremely unpleasant appeals; but I trust I shall stand excused for the explanation, when I was given, by your bishop, to understand that I was an abetter of schism. Do, my brethren, bear with my weakness—my heart is full—many accusations have been heaped upon me before—but never until now was I charged with endeavouring to rend that unity, which, if I know myself, I would sacrifice my life to preserve and to defend.

May God grant to you the perfection of charity and the fulness of every grace. May he make and preserve you one fold under one shepherd, with all humility and mildness, with patience, supporting one another in charity, careful to keep the unity of spirit in the bond of peace, one body and one spirit: as you are called in the hope of your vocation. Your bishop in the church, and your church in the bishop, is the prayer of him who feels afflicted at the charge of scandalising you; when he only intended to advise a brother who was misled, and bring harmony among you.

Yours, with respect and sincerity,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

HAROLD CORRESPONDENCE

Introductory Note: To understand the following letters of Bishop England, a short statement is here given of the famous Harold Case. Reverend Wm. V. Harold and John Ryan, two Dominican friars, who had served for several years in the city of Philadelphia, received in March, 1828, orders from Rome, that is from the Propaganda and from the Superior General of their order, to leave for Cincinnati, O., and take positions there. They refused and appealed for redress to the Department of State at Washington. Against all rule and precedent, the matter was taken up and led to a diplomatic correspondence of Secretary H. Clay with Mr. Brown, the American Plenipotentiary at Paris and Mr. Cicognani, American Consul at Rome. Next year the two priests returned to Ireland.—ED.

PHILADELPHIA HOTEL, Sept. 17, 1829.

To Reverend W. V. Harold.

Reverend Sir:—The Bishop of Charleston presents his respects to the Reverend Wm. Vincent Harold, and begs leave to inform him, that although he saw what purported to be a copy of Mr. Harold's letter to Mr. Clay, some time since, he could not believe that the government of the United States would take any step in consequence thereof. To his surprise he yesterday found the contrary to have been the fact.

The Bishop differs very widely with Mr. Harold in his views, as expressed in that letter. He also believes that the ex-President has interfered in the concerns of the Church in a way in which he neither could nor ought.

As regards Mr. Harold's peculiar case, the Bishop neither desires nor intends to interfere, especially under its present circumstances; but as an American bishop, and an American citizen, he feels it to be his duty to guard against similar interference in future.

Mr. Harold has referred to some previous interference of the government of the United States with the proceedings of the Holy See, as a ground for his call to interfere in his own case. This previous interference is not known to the Bishop, and the object of the present note is to request Mr. Harold, as a favour, to furnish the Bishop with such information as he can in its regard.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

PHILADELPHIA HOTEL, Sept. 17, 1829.

To the Reverend William Vincent Harold, and so forth.

Reverend Sir:—The Bishop of Charleston feels obliged to the Rev-

erend William Vincent Harold for his prompt and full answer to the note of this morning. The bishop begs leave to inform Mr. Harold, that although he has no intention at present of publishing the pamphlet, or any part of it, he considers himself at liberty to act according to his own discretion, as he has had, without any condition, copies thereof already in his possession.[20]

As regards Mr. Harold's own case, either respecting the Bishop of Philadelphia, the Holy See, or the government of the United States, the Bishop of Charleston does not at present intend to interfere: neither does he mean to take up, or to treat of the conduct of the late archbishop as regards Mr. Harold. Upon the general question, the Bishop of Charleston is free to confess that he is not satisfied with the present state of discipline in the United States, as regards churches or as regards priests; neither does he concur in the view taken by Mr. Harold respecting those subjects in his letter to Mr. Clay. To state his views at present to Mr. Harold could answer no useful purpose.

The bishop repeats his acknowledgment to Mr. Harold for the information which he has communicated; and shall avail himself thereof in the prosecution of any inquiry which he deems it his duty to follow up to some satisfactory results.[21]

The bishop feels much obliged by Mr. Harold's kind offer of service in Ireland, and regrets that he has not had leisure to write those letters which he would otherwise trouble Mr. Harold to deliver. He leaves this city in the morning, and wishes Mr. Harold better and more pleasing scenes in Ireland than he has met with in this country.

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

NOTE.—The letters of Messrs. Brent and Matthews, No. 8 and 9, will exhibit how far Mr. Harold was warranted in making the serious charge which his note contains against Mr. Daniel Brent; and his consequential denunciation which would exclude all Catholics from employment in public offices, and "from every station where confidence and honour are required."

The correspondence to which Mr. Harold alludes, as between the late Archbishop of Baltimore and himself, was printed in pamphlet form, and widely circulated though not formally published—and in the opinion of the Bishop of Charleston need not be withheld from publica-

[20] The pamphlet contained the correspondence between Mr. Harold and the late Archbishop of Baltimore, and was widely circulated though not formally published.—I. A. R.

[21] The previous interference of the government on which the Bishop of Charleston desires to be informed, related to a decree of Pope Pius VII. regarding the farm of White Marsh.—I. A. R.

tion by any friend of the archbishop. Its publication here would be altogether extraneous.

GEORGETOWN, D. C., Sept 26, 1830.

To His Excellency Andrew Jackson, President of the United States.

Sir:—As an American citizen and bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, I take the liberty of drawing your attention to the following facts, and presenting the annexed request.

The spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy of the Pope, who is Bishop of Rome, is an essential portion of the Roman Catholic religion. Any attempt to overawe this head of the Church in the exercise of his spiritual and ecclesiastical authority is believed to be such an interference with the Roman Catholic religion, which is that of a large body of citizens, as the Constitution of the United States forbids to Congress. It is believed that no officer of the general government could constitutionally do that which is forbidden to the representatives of the states and of the people.

The said head of the Roman Catholic Church, happens, at present, to be a temporal sovereign, and to have civil dominion in a large portion of Italy: but it is clear that his dominion does not extend to this country, nor does he claim to have such power here: and if he did so claim, the Roman Catholic citizens of this Union would feel themselves called upon effectually to resist the same: and should the Pope either for the enforcement of his spiritual decrees, or in furtherance of any temporal claim, attempt to use any physical force, the constituted authorities of the several states are fully competent and well disposed, as they are bound, to protect their citizens from any such usurpation or aggression. It appears to be their duty to do so, to the exclusion of the general government, within their several limits; unless from want of power, which is a ridiculous supposition, they should be compelled to have constitutional recourse to the Federal Executive for protection.

It does not appear that any state has found it necessary to make such a call upon the Executive of the Union, and therefore, there does not appear to have been any constitutional ground for its interference: yet it is believed that such interference has taken place in two distinct instances at least.

The first related to a decree of Pope Pius VII. regarding a disputed claim between the late Archbishop of Baltimore and a certain corporation of Catholic clergymen, concerning the possession of a farm—upon which the Pope, acting as an arbitrator, pronounced in favour of one party, and the other applied to the department of state, and procured, as it

is believed, that instructions should be transmitted to one of our ministers residing abroad, in the year 1824 or 1825, to interfere in such a manner as to exhibit the opposition of the federal government to the papal decree: whereas it is conceived that if the parties dissented from the arbitration, the proper mode would have been to leave the question to be decided by the court having proper jurisdiction in that part of Maryland where the farm was situated.

The second case is more recent; it occurred last year. Two priests in Philadelphia were considered to have caused trouble in the church of that city. The See of Rome, not its civil government, was called upon to take cognizance of their conduct. The Pope desired that all parties concerned in the disputes should withdraw from the church of that city, so that peace might be thereby restored. In conformity with this direction, the Bishop of Philadelphia withdrew to Rome: the two priests applied for protection to the department of state, and the President directed a letter to be written from that department, in which the cause of these two priests is countenanced by the government in such a manner as appears to interfere with the freedom of agency of the spiritual head of the Roman Catholic Church, and to cause several citizens to dread that repetition of such conduct would be the commencement of a union of church and state, as well as an unconstitutional meddling with the affairs of our ecclesiastical body, productive of serious mischief to ourselves, and affording a just cause of jealousy to our fellow-citizens of other religious denominations.

I have therefore humbly to request, that your Excellency will cause inquiry to be made in the office of the Secretary of State for such documents as might there exist, relating to those or any similar cases, and also that copies thereof should be furnished to me for publication, so that the citizens at large should be satisfied that no private or unconstitutional interference in their religious concerns shall be permitted by the President of the United States.

I have the honour to be,

Respectfully, Your Excellency's obedient, humble servant,

JOHN, *Bishop of Charleston.*

NOTE.—In an interview on the next day, when the bishop called by appointment at the President's house, his Excellency expressed his coincidence with the views in the letter, and gave the necessary directions for furnishing the documents. Mr. Brent stated that Mr. Harold was under a mistake regarding the interference of that department in the differences between the Archbishop and the Jesuits: and that there were no documents upon that subject in the department.

Case submitted by the Bishop of Charleston for the opinions of the Hon. R. B. Taney, Attorney-general of Maryland, and of the Hon. Wm. Gaston of North Carolina.

The order of Dominican friars, is a voluntary association of men of various nations, in the Roman Catholic Church, who, after due deliberation and probation, have freely and repeatedly and humbly besought admission to the society, and been admitted upon their making a solemn vow to continue always bound by its constitution and statutes, with which they had previously been made fully acquainted.

By this vow they freely bind themselves to pay obedience to the general of their order, and assent to the infliction of the penalties designated in the statutes, or in the constitution of their order, or in the canons of the Roman Catholic Church in case of disobedience. The penalties are of a defined and spiritual description and nature; and so well known, in general, to members of the order, that when the superior directs anything to be done by virtue of the obedience which has been promised, the penalty of neglect or refusal is sufficiently indicated by the phrase, "but if you will not obey, you know the consequences," or some similar expression.

Those friars are generally priests, and they are generally appointed to missionary stations, not by the bishop of a diocess, but under the privilege of the Pope, by their own superior, (a member of their order,) with the consent and approbation of the bishop or ordinary superior of the diocess or district in which the missionary station exists, and under the inspection of that ordinary.

A priest who is a member of the Dominican order, was stationed in the city of Philadelphia, and upon the suggestion of the bishop, it was thought better that he should leave the station, in which the bishop did not wish him to remain. The general superior of the order, was an alien residing in Europe; the priest in Philadelphia was a citizen of the United States. The general sent this priest an order, "in virtue of obedience," to leave Philadelphia and repair to Cincinnati, to be there engaged in the ministry under a superior of his own order: reminding him of the penalties which he knew would be the consequence of his refusal to change the station of his ministry.

1. It is asked. Whether this alien general by this order and threat has violated the civil rights of this citizen friar?

2. Suppose the Pope, who appears to be a foreign sovereign, concurs in this order, not in virtue of his temporal sovereignty over a portion of Italy, but in virtue of his spiritual jurisdiction in the Catholic Church; and this friar, who never was a subject of the sovereign of the

Papal States, should, as a member of the Catholic Church, and particularly as a member of the Dominican order, obey this command. Does the friar, by so doing, transfer any portion of the allegiance which he owes to the United States, or to Pennsylvania, to the sovereign of the Papal States?

3. Can the order so given, and the obedience to which can be enforced only by the conscience of the citizen priest himself, or by the spiritual penalties, inflicted by an ecclesiastical superior, be construed into a sentence by a foreign sovereign to banish this citizen from Philadelphia, and to imprison or relegate him at Cincinnati? And is the government of the United States called upon or warranted to interpose itself in this case, for the protection of this citizen friar against this order?

Opinion of Mr. Taney:—I proceed to answer the foregoing questions in the order in which they were put to me:—

1st. The Roman Catholic priest, as a citizen of the United States, had undoubtedly a right to become a member of the Dominican society; and by becoming a member he agreed to be bound by its constitution and statutes, and to subject himself to its officers and tribunals as thereby provided for. The order above mentioned, and the spiritual penalties that may be inflicted for disobedience by the constituted authorities of the society according to its laws, are therefore justified by the agreement of the party himself, and do not violate any of his rights as a citizen of Pennsylvania or the United States.

2. The power exercised by the Pope in the Roman Catholic Church has no connexion whatever with that which he possesses as a temporal prince, but differs from it altogether in its character and the means by which it is enforced. And if he should be deprived of his temporal dominion, his jurisdiction in the Roman Catholic Church would remain unaltered in any respect. His authority in the Church is merely spiritual, and obedience in spiritual matters to a spiritual superior, is certainly no transfer of allegiance in temporal concerns; and it is impossible in the nature of things that obedience due from a Roman Catholic, whether layman or clergyman, to the authority of the Pope, in spiritual matters, can ever come in conflict with the duties of allegiance or the calls of patriotism.

3. The spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope is a part of the Roman Catholic religion, and is necessary to the free exercise of that religion. And it is a part of the civil rights of those citizens of the United States who are members of the Roman Catholic Church, that this spiritual

jurisdiction should be freely exercised, and the government of the United States have no right to restrain it, nor to interfere with it. The order mentioned in this question might lawfully be given by the Pope and the penalties for disobedience inflicted. The order and the penalties have no connexion with his character as a foreign temporal sovereign. And such an interposition on the part of the government of the United States, as is above suggested, would be an unwarrantable invasion of the rights of the Roman Catholic citizens of this country, and a palpable violation of the principles of the Constitution.

(Signed) R. B. TANEY.

BALTIMORE, Nov. 23, 1829.

Opinion of Mr. Gaston:—In answer to the first question proposed, it may be premised that one of the facts stated—the alienage of the ecclesiastical superior—is an immaterial circumstance. A violation of the civil rights of an individual is precisely the same in kind, whatever it may be in degree, whether it be committed by a fellow-citizen or by a foreigner. The question is then resolved into the inquiry, whether an order from a religious superior can issue in our country without an interference with civil liberty—whether religious subordination can be tolerated in our land. The law cannot regard these orders so long as they are enforced by spiritual sanctions only, but as mere appeals by certain individuals to the consciences of others. It leaves to all unqualified freedom of conscience, and it would travel as completely out of its proper sphere by forbidding such admonitions to be given as by compelling them to be obeyed.

The Bishop of Rome is the acknowledged head of the Roman Catholic Church, and as such must have a jurisdiction of some sort over it. Jurisdiction implies obedience. The second question therefore involves the inquiry, whether the fact, that the primate of the Church possesses a temporal sovereignty over a portion of Italy renders spiritual obedience on the part of its members here a breach of their allegiance. I answer, no. First, because he who omits no duty and violates no command, which fidelity to his country demands, has fulfilled all the obligations of allegiance. Secondly, because the obedience rendered to the orders of the spiritual superior, has no connexion with or reference to the temporal authority of that superior, and would be precisely the same whether such superior were the inmate of a prison or the possessor of a throne. And thirdly, because the conscience of him who obeys, and his conscience only, regulates his obedience, and of that conscience his country allows him the undisputed dominion.

The answer to the third question must follow that to the second. The right of the citizen cannot be infringed by a requisition which he may disobey if his conscience will permit, and the authority of his government is not concerned in a matter purely of religious obligation. That cannot be deemed a sentence which depends for its execution on the enlightened will of the individual to whom it is directed; the aid of the government is not needed to protect him against admonitions addressed to his conscience; and those intrusted with temporal power here have no right in interpose to prevent his receiving or to induce him to disregard them.

(Signed) Wm. Gaston.

Raleigh, 26th Nov., 1829.

N. B.—This case was also submitted to the Hon. Attorney-General of the United States, (Mr. Berrien), but he, through delicacy, declined giving an opinion.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

This book is due on the date indicated below, or at the expiration of a definite period after the date of borrowing, as provided by the library rules or by special arrangement with the Librarian in charge.

DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE	DATE BORROWED	DATE DUE
C28 (1149) 100M			

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
0035519061
DO NOT
PHOTOCOPY

936 En34
v.6